DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 203 953 JC 810 410

AUTHOR	Hunter, Russell; Sheldon, M. Stephen
TITLE	Statewide Longitudinal Study: Report on Academic Year 1979-80. Part 4--Spring 1980 Results.
INSTITUTION	Los Angeles Pierce Coll., Woodland Hills, Calif.
SPONS AGENCY	California Community Colleges, Sacramento. Office of the Chancellor.; Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	81
NOTE	139p.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Achievement; *Adult Students; *College Role; *College Transfer Students; Community Colleges; Economically Disadvantaged; Educationally Disadvantaged; Enrollment; Ethnic Groups; Longitudinal Studies; State Surveys; *Student Characteristics; Student Problems; Two Year Colleges; *Two Year College Students; *Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS	*California

ABSTRACT

As the fourth in a series of reports on a longitudinal study of over 7,000 students who entered 15 California community colleges in Fall 1978, this eight-chapter report profiles the students as of Spring 1980 in terms of: (1) demography, academic progress, and employment status; and (2) their distribution among 18 "prototypes," defined by the types of courses taken, student aspirations, enrollment patterns, and records of achievement. Chapter I details data collection procedures, including the procedures for "warehousing" and "prototyping" students, and overall study objectives. Chapter II profiles the students in terms of sex, age, ethnicity, enrollment patterns, units completed, educational objectives, types of jobs held, and wages received. In addition, Chapter II summarizes academic data specific to transfer, vocational, and special interest student groups. Chapter III defines the narrower "prototypes" falling under these three groupings and examines the distribution of students among these categories as a means of looking at college functions in light of students' aspirations, enrollment patterns, and achievement. Chapters IV, V, and VI present data for White, Black, Hispanic, and Asian students; financially disabled students; and educationally disadvantaged students. Chapter VII discusses problems faced by special categories of students, such as displaced homemakers and minorities. Summary conclusions are presented in Chapter VIII. (JP)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED203953

STATEWIDE LONGITUDINAL STUDY

Report on Academic Year 1979-80

Part 4 - Spring 1980 Results

Russell Hunter

M. Stephen Sheldon

Los Angeles Fierce College

JC 810 410

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R. Hunter

S. Sheldon

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

STATEWIDE LONGITUDINAL STUDY

Report on Academic Year 1979-80

Part 4 - Spring 1980 Results

Funded by the Chancellor's Office
California Community Colleges
under P.L. 94-482, Title II, Part A

State of California Contract No. 9348

Russell Hunter

M. Stephen Sheldon

Los Angeles Pierce College

The activity that is the subject of this report was supported in whole or in part by the U.S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare. However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the U.S. Office of Education, and no official endorsement by the U.S. Office of Education should be inferred.

Preface

The data presented in this report, Part 4 of the Statewide Longitudinal Study, consist of in-depth examinations of Student Prototypes, Ethnic Groups, Financially Disadvantaged, and Educationally Disadvantaged Students. In a sense, these data can be considered controversial.

Tables taken out of context and used by the naive or by those who hold prejudice against the community college educational system may result in undeserved plaudits or condemnation. Individual tables may make California Community Colleges appear racist or egalitarian, sexist or feminist, marvelous successes or abysmal failures. A fair picture will emerge only if the document is considered in its entirety.

We, the Consortium of the Statewide Longitudinal Study, caution the reader to consider all the evidence presented, and to be cautious in the use of individual tables. Generalizations about the effectiveness or behavior of California Community Colleges will be accurate only if the total picture is taken into account.

STATEWIDE LONGITUDINAL STUDY

Consortium Members - 1980-81

M. Stephen Sheldon
Project Director

Russell Hunter
Project Administrator

Participating Colleges	Consortium Members
Antelope Valley College	Frank Roberts
Bakersfield	David C. Scott Jim Opperman
Cerritos College	Elizabeth Stewart Janice Dennis-Rounds
Contra Costa College	Phyllis Goldman
El Camino College	Jerry Garlock
Evergreen Valley College	Jon Kangas Nancy Reicheld
Foothill College	Nilo Sarmiento
Golden West College	Rick Forsberg
Imperial Valley College	Paulette Broome Dean Leptich
Los Angeles City College	Ben Gold
Los Angeles Pierce College	Steve Sheldon
Sacramento City College	Bill Smith Pat Caffrey
Santa Ana College	Julie Slark
Shasta College	Walter Brooks Leslie Winegar
Southwestern College	Allan MacDougall

Other Consortium Members

William Boakes
Chancellor's Office
Calif. Comm. Colleges

Arthur Cohen
Center for the Study
of Comm. Colleges

Clive Grafton
USC

Dorothy Knoell
CPEC

William Morris
Chancellor's Office
Calif. Comm. Colleges

Paul Preising
NOR CAL

Angelo Segalla
R & D Commission of
CCJCA

Garth Sorenson
UCLA

Robert Thompson
Foothill-DeAnza
Community College
District

Dale Rezabek
CACVE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter — Page

PREFACE

CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND 1-1
  Procedures 1-3
    Sampling 1-3
    Interviewing 1-3
    Instruments for Collecting Data 1-4
    Transmitting Data 1-4
    Analyzing Data 1-4
    Special Data Collecting Procedures 1-5
      Warehousing of Students 1-5
      Prototyping of Students 1-6
  Goals and Objectives of the SLS 1-7
      Summary 1-10
      Student Prototypes 1-12

CHAPTER 2 SPRING 1980 DATA RESULTS 2-1
  Background, Non-Warehoused Students 2-1
    Demographic Variables 2-2
    Academic Variables 2-4
    Data on Non-Warehoused Students 2-7
    Work Variables 2-8
  Transfer Student Ratings 2-10
  Vocational Student Ratings 2-14

Chapter | Page

CHAPTER 2 (cont.)

Data 2-14

Discussion 2-20

Special Interest Students 2-20

Data 2-20

Discussion 2-23

CHAPTER 3 STUDENT PROTOTYPES 3-1

Course Types 3-2

Prototype Definitions 3-3

Transfer Function 3-4

Vocational Function 3-5

Special Interest Function 3-6

Prototyping 3-7

Findings 3-9

Discussion 3-13

CHAPTER 4 COMPARISONS AMONG ETHNIC GROUPS 4-1

Grade Point Average 4-3

Job Information 4-4

Student Prototypes 4-6

Summary 4-9

Job Information 4-9

Student Prototypes 4-10

Vocational Student Findings by Ethnicity 4-11

Summary 4-17

Chapter Page

CHAPTER 5 THE FINANCIALLY DISADVANTAGED STUDENT 5-1

Summary 5-12

Vocational Student Findings by Financial Disadvantage 5-12

Summary 5-16

CHAPTER 6 THE EDUCATIONALLY DISADVANTAGED STUDENT 6-1

Summary 6-8

Vocational Student Findings by Educational Disadvantage 6-9

Summary 6-14

CHAPTER 7 SPECIAL STUDENTS 7-1

Findings 7-2

Ethnic Minority Student Problems 7-2

Minority Student Solutions 7-3

Financially Disadvantaged Student Problems 7-4

Financially Disadvantaged Student Solutions 7-5

Financial-Aid-Students' Comments on Financial Aids Office 7-6

Educationally Disadvantaged Student Problems 7-6

Educationally Disadvantaged Student Solutions 7-7

Educationally Disadvantaged Students' Comments on Facilities 7-8

Limited English Speaking Ability (LESA) Students' Problems 7-8

Chapter Page

CHAPTER 7 (cont.)

LESA Students' Solutions 7-9

LESA Students' Comments on Facilities 7-10

Displaced Homemaker Problems 7-10

Displaced Homemaker Solutions 7-11

Displaced Homemaker Ratings of Facilities 7-12

Non-Traditional Major Problems 7-12

Physically Handicapped Problems 7-12

Physically Handicapped Solutions 7-14

Physically Handicapped Students' Ratings of Facilities 7-15

Summary 7-15

CHAPTER 8 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS 8-1

Comparison of Ethnic Groups 8-5

Comparisons with Financially Disadvantaged 8-5

Comparisons with Educationally Disadvantaged 8-6

Special Student Findings 8-7

TABLES

Table		Page
Table 2-1	Sex	2-2
Table 2-2	Age as of Spring 1980	2-3
Table 2-3	Ethnicity	2-3
Table 2-4	Enrollment Patterns	2-4
Table 2-5	Grade Point Average	2-5
Table 2-6	Academic Record Data	2-6
Table 2-7	Reasons for Attendance	2-7
Table 2-8	Job Skill Level	2-8
Table 2-9	Change in Skill Level of Job	2-9
Table 2-10	Hourly Pay	2-9
Table 2-11	Pay Change	2-10
Table 2-12	Transferred Students: Colleges Currently Attending	2-11
Table 2-13	Transfer Students: How Well Prepared for Work at College	2-11
Table 2-14	Transfer Students: College Transferring To	2-12
Table 2-15	Transfer Students: Semesters Completed Before Transfer	2-13
Table 2-16	Transfer Students: Progress Made Toward a Transfer	2-14
Table 2-17	Vocational Students: Most Important Reason for Attending	2-14
Table 2-18	Vocational Students: Courses Related to Work	2-15
Table 2-19	Vocational Students: Courses Studied Helpful in Getting Jobs	2-16

TABLES (cont.)

Table		Page
Table 2-20	Vocational Students: Courses Studied Helpful on Job	2-17
Table 2-21	Vocational Students: Courses Studied Helpful in Getting Pay Raises	2-17
Table 2-22	Vocational Students: Courses Studied Helpful in Getting Promotion	2-18
Table 2-23	Vocational Students: Importance of Getting Credit for Class	2-19
Table 2-24	Vocational Students: Future Courses Planned at College	2-19
Table 2-25	Special Interest Students: Courses Most Interested In	2-21
Table 2-26	Special Interest Students: Importance of Getting Credit for Class	2-22
Table 2-27	Special Interest Students: Future Courses Planned	2-22
Table 2-28	Special Interest Students: Goals Met While Attending College	2-23
Table 3-1	Transfer, Vocational, and Special Interest Functions	3-9
Table 3-2	Student Prototypes by Percentage	3-10
Table 3-3	Transfer Prototypes by Percentage	3-11
Table 3-4	Vocational Function by Percentage	3-12
Table 3-5	Special Interest Function by Percentage	3-13
Table 4-1	Ethnic Groups	4-2
Table 4-2	Enrollment Patterns: Consecutive Semesters	4-2
Table 4-3	Grade Point Average	4-3
Table 4-4	Average GPA	4-3
Table 4-5	Job Level Status	4-4

TABLES (cont.)

Table		Page
Table 4-6	Job Skill Level Change by Ethnicity	4-5
Table 4-7	Wages by Ethnic Groups	4-6
Table 4-8	Pay Change by Ethnicity	4-6
Table 4-9	Transfer Prototypes	4-7
Table 4-10	Vocational Prototypes	4-7
Table 4-11	Special Interest Prototypes	4-8
Table 4-12	Vocational Students: Consecutive Enrollment by Ethnicity	4-11
Table 4-13	Vocational Students: GPA by Ethnicity	4-12
Table 4-14	Vocational Students: Mean GPA by Ethnicity	4-13
Table 4-15	Vocational Students: Job Level by Ethnicity	4-13
Table 4-16	Vocational Students: Job Change by Ethnicity	4-14
Table 4-17	Vocational Students: Wages by Ethnicity	4-15
Table 4-18	Vocational Students: Wage Change by Ethnicity	4-15
Table 4-19	Vocational Students: Prototypes by Ethnicity	4-16
Table 5-1	Distribution Across Colleges	5-2
Table 5-2	Comparisons by Attendance in Spring 1980	5-3
Table 5-3	Sample Consecutive Enrollment Patterns by Financially Disadvantaged	5-3
Table 5-4	Comparisons by Age	5-4
Table 5-5	Comparison of Sex Proportions	5-4
Table 5-6	Comparison of Ethnic Proportions	5-5

TABLES (cont.)

Table Page

Table 5-7 GPA by Financially Disadvantaged 5-6
Table 5-8 Mean GPAs by Financially Disadvantaged 5-6
Table 5-9 Job Skill Level by Financially Disadvantaged 5-7
Table 5-10 Job Skill Level Change by Financially Disadvantaged 5-7
Table 5-11 Wages by Financially Disadvantaged 5-8
Table 5-12 WAGE CHANGE by Financially Disadvantaged 5-8
Table 5-13 Transfer Prototypes by Financially Disadvantaged 5-9
Table 5-14 Vocational Prototypes by Financially Disadvantaged 5-9
Table 5-15 Special Interest Prototypes by Financially Disadvantaged 5-10
Table 5-16 Vocational Students: Continuous Attendance by Financially Disadvantaged 5-13
Table 5-17 Vocational Students: GPA by Financially Disadvantaged 5-13
Table 5-18 Vocational Students: Mean GPA by Financially Disadvantaged 5-14
Table 5-19 Vocational Students: Job Skill Level 5-14
Table 5-20 Vocational Students: Job Skill Level Change by Financially Disadvantaged 5-15
Table 5-21 Vocational Students: Wages by Financially Disadvantaged 5-15
Table 5-22 Vocational Students: Wage Change by Financially Disadvantaged 5-15
Table 5-23 Vocational Students: Prototypes by Financially Disadvantaged 5-16
Table 6-1 Educationally Disadvantaged by College 6-1

TABLES (cont.)

Table		Page
Table 6-2	Educationally Disadvantaged by Attendance	6-2
Table 6-3	Consecutive Enrollment Patterns by Educationally Disadvantaged	6-3
Table 6-4	Comparison of Ethnic Proportions	6-3
Table 6-5	Educationally Disadvantaged by GPA	6-4
Table 6-6	Educationally Disadvantaged by Mean GPA	6-4
Table 6-7	Educationally Disadvantaged by Job Skill Level	6-5
Table 6-8	Educationally Disadvantaged by Job Change	6-5
Table 6-9	Educationally Disadvantaged by Average Wage	6-6
Table 6-10	Educationally Disadvantaged by Pay Change	6-6
Table 6-11	Educationally Disadvantaged by Transfer Prototype	6-7
Table 6-12	Educationally Disadvantaged by Vocational Prototype	6-7
Table 6-13	Educationally Disadvantaged by Special Interest Prototype	6-8
Table 6-14	Vocational Educationally Disadvantaged by Consecutive Enrollment Patterns	6-10
Table 6-15	Vocational Educationally Disadvantaged by GPA	6-10
Table 6-16	Vocational Educationally Disadvantaged by Mean GPA	6-11
Table 6-17	Vocational Educationally Disadvantaged by Job Skill Level	6-11
Table 6-18	Vocational Educationally Disadvantaged by Mean Wage	6-12

TABLES (cont.)

Table		Page
Table 6-19	Vocational Educationally Disadvantaged by Job Change	6-12
Table 6-20	Vocational Educationally Disadvantaged by Pay Change	6-13
Table 6-21	Vocational Educationally Disadvantaged by Vocational Prototype	6-13

Chapter 1

Introduction and Background

This report describes the results of data collection during Spring 1980 for the Statewide Longitudinal Study (SLS). It is the fourth in a series of reports on that project. Part 1 described the data collected in Fall 1978, Part 2 the data from Spring 1979, and Part 3 the data collected in Fall 1979. These reports are available through:

ERIC Clearinghouse for Community Colleges
University of California
Los Angeles, CA 90024

Data was to be collected for the SLS for three academic years, from Fall 1978 through Spring 1981.

The present report has seven chapters. The remainder of this chapter contains descriptions of the background of the study, the research procedures, the goals and objectives, and the progress made during the academic year 1979-80.

Chapter 2 contains descriptions of overall findings on data collected for the entire sample during Spring 1980. Much of that chapter updates and compares current data with data collected in earlier semesters.

Chapter 3 contains a detailed breakdown of Spring 1980 data by prototypes. (Tentative prototypes advanced as hypotheses in Part 2 of the SLS report were suggested with refinements in

Part 3.) The results of prototyping of all students in the sample in Spring 1980 are given.

Chapter 4 provides comparisons between four ethnic groups--Asians, Blacks, Hispanics and Whites--in terms of their academic and job performance in Spring 1980. Two comparisons will be made for each variable; the first includes all students in the sample, the second includes vocational students only.

Chapter 5 contains comparisons between those who were and were not Financially Disadvantaged (self-defined) during the 1978-79 period. Comparisons will be made on the same variables as were made on ethnic groups.

Chapter 6 contains similar comparisons between those who were and were not Educationally Disadvantaged (self-defined) during the 1978-79 period. The same variables will be used for comparisons as in Chapters 3 and 4.

Chapter 7 contains anecdotal reports on the problems experienced by the following special groups:

1. Ethnic Minorities
2. Financially Disadvantaged
3. Educationally Disadvantaged
4. Limited English-Speaking Students
5. Displaced Homemakers
6. Non-Traditional Majors
7. Physically Handicapped Students

The final chapter summarizes the major findings of the study through Spring 1980.

PROCEDURES

The study is governed by a 30-person consortium composed of a coordinator from each participating college, members of the faculties of the University of California, the University of Southern California, statewide agencies such as the Chancellor's Office, California Community Colleges, the Post-Secondary Education Commission, and from two community college research organizations, Northern California Cooperative Research Group and Southern California Community College Institutional Research Association. Data have been collected on each person in the sample twice each academic year. There are two sources of data: college records and highly structured telephone interviews.

Sampling

Each of the participating colleges selected a random sample of students newly admitted in Fall 1978. The samples were large enough to reduce the sampling error to 4 percent. Using new admittees reported on form CCAF131 and criteria in the Student Accountability Model Manual (Gold, 1978), an oversize sample was drawn to allow for attrition between registration and the first Census Week, Fall 1978. Those who had zero active units by Census Week were interviewed once. The results were reported in the SLS report, Part 1. Those neither interviewed nor enrolled in Spring 1978 were excluded from the sample. The total sample size for this report is 7,157 students.

Interviewing

Telephone interviews were conducted, and the results coded using common data sheets, interview guides, definition sheets, and coding instructions. There were differences in some of the questions asked of those in attendance and those not attending. Solutions to problems arising during data collection were disseminated to the participating colleges through frequent newsletters.

Instruments for Collecting Data

Data collection instruments were originated by the consortium and prepared for use at the project office. Data collection policies were set by the consortium and reviewed by the project director. The instruments were prepared by the project administrator. Draft copies were circulated to consortium members and field tested before final documents were printed.

Transmitting Data

Data from college records and interviews were transmitted to the project office by punched cards. These cards were checked for logic and outlier errors before storage. Feedback and correction sheets were provided to the participating colleges.

Analyzing Data

Two programs from Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) were used for data analysis: FREQUENCIES and CROSSTABS. The former were used to provide frequency distributions of particular aspects of the sample or a subgroup. The latter were used to describe or to test for relationships between variables, e.g., crosstabulating SEX by ETHNICITY.

Special Data Collecting Procedures

For Spring 1980, there were two deviations from normal data collection procedures. First, sample subjects who met certain criteria were "warehoused" or eliminated from interviewing for Spring 1980 but not permanently dropped from the sample. Second, coordinators on each campus recorded their systematic inferences about the educational motives and aspirations of all sample members. All students in the sample were "prototyped," that is, assigned to 1 of 18 descriptor groups. These "prototypes" are defined below.

Warehousing of Students

Attempts were made in each of the three previous data collection periods to reach and interview every member of the sample. A reasonably large number of sample members (about 38 percent) who were first enrolled in Fall 1978 did not enroll in Spring 1979. Many had been interviewed twice since having left the colleges. The consortium decided that all former students who had been interviewed at least once since they left the participating college, and had not re-enrolled, should not be called in Spring 1980. These students were "warehoused" but not eliminated from the sample. Although record data were reported for such students, it was felt that the interview data would be redundant and yield no new information.

Prototyping of Students

For Spring 1980 a third type of data was added to that gleaned from college records or extracted from telephone interviews. This third source of data was the judgment or systematic inference of the coordinators about the type of student each member of the sample was, based on educational aspirations, enrollment patterns, and achievement.

The 18 prototypes are derived from three basic categories: (1) Transfer Students, those who wish to transfer to a four-year college, (2) Vocational Students, those who want to learn vocational skills for gainful employment, and (3) Special Interest Students, those who attend community colleges for personal reasons not connected with transfer or vocational training. The 18 prototypes are listed below and described in Chapter 3.

Transfer Students

Full-Time Transfer Students
Part-Time Transfer Students
Undisciplined Transfer Students
Technical Transfer Students
Intercollegiate Athletes
Financial Aid Seeking Students
Expediter Students

Vocational Students

(Technical Transfer Students)
Career Program Completers
Job Seekers
Job Upgraders
Second Career Students
License Maintainers

Special Interest Students

- Leisure Skills Students
- Education Seekers
- Art and Culture Students
- Explorer/Experimenter Students
- Basic Skills Students
- Lateral Transfer Students

GOALS AND OBJECTIVES OF THE SLS

The goals and objectives shown below are those for the initial year of the study. They were:

1. To provide detailed information about pertinent aspects of the student bodies of California Community Colleges.

Objective 1A

To produce frequency distributions and cross-tabulations of descriptive and demographic student data and to compute appropriate descriptive statistics.

Objective 1A was met, in part, during the first year of the study. Further information on the demographics of the sample will be included in this and subsequent reports.

Objective 1B

To report detailed reasons given for specific student actions such as:

a. Being admitted to college but never enrolling in classes.

b. Enrolling in courses but never attending.

c. Attending classes, but withdrawing or being excluded before Census Week.

Objective 1C

To determine existing sex, race, or age bias in occupational programs.

Objective 1C was met, in part, during the first year of the study. Results were reported in the Statewide Longitudinal Study Report for 1978-79, Part 1. Attention was paid to this variable during the current year of the study. Information collected on this objective will be found in Chapter 6 of this report.

2. To provide information about the effects of the college programs on the lives of students.

   Objective 2A

   To compare job success of Vocational and Non-Vocational students after one, two, and three years as measured by:

   a. Rate of employment in field studied.

   b. Skill level of job in field studied.

   c. Salary of job in field studied.

Objective 2A was addressed during the first year of the study and will continue to be examined until the study is completed in Spring 1981. Data on this objective are included in this report.

   Objective 2B

   To compare and contrast perceptions concerning the value of community college experience among students.

3. To provide further information on the efficacy of small sampling in completing a useful and meaningful longitudinal study.

   Objective 3A

   To compare demographic data of the samples drawn with those of the populations of the participating colleges and the state as a whole.

4. To provide information about the feasibility of using a small-sample, longitudinal study for supplying data to state and federal agencies valid for reporting purposes and for providing individual community colleges with a model to use in answering questions of a local nature.

   Objective 4A

   To determine the similarity of federal and state reports when the data are estimated from the total student body, and when they are extracted from the sample.

5. To provide information on the factors within certain vocational programs that inhibit Limited-English-Speaking and Non-English-Speaking (LES/NES) students from enrolling.

   Objective 5A

   To provide detailed information emanating from the students themselves of the factors within the local education agencies that are perceived by LES/NES students to be discriminatory.

The objective was met, in part, in the Statewide Longitudinal Study, Parts 1 and 2, and will be addressed further in this report. This paper will include a description of the problems encountered by Limited English Speaking students in their college work.

6. To provide assistance in identifying needed curriculum and services for Vocational Education programs for disadvantaged and/or handicapped students, displaced homemakers, single heads of household, homemakers working part-time or for students enrolled in majors which are non-traditional for their sex.

   Objective 6A

   To provide detailed information emanating from the disadvantaged and handicapped students regarding the specific changes in curriculum and services that will make vocational education programs more attractive to them and more feasible for them to complete.

Objective 6B

To provide detailed information on the ways programs can be changed so that displaced homemakers, single heads of household, homemakers working part-time and students in programs nontraditional for their sex can enroll in and complete programs satisfactorily.

SUMMARY

Goal 1, Objective 1A, collection and dissemination of demographic information about the sample, has been partially met. The unmet portion of this goal requires longitudinal reporting, the semester-by-semester record of the demographics of subsets of the sample (e.g., attending and non-attending members) as the study progresses.

Objective 1B was completely met during the first year of the study. Objective 1C has been partially met. Like Objective 1A, it can only be met in the ensuing years of the study.

Goal 2, the effects of college upon the lives of the members of the sample and their perceptions of these effects, has been partially met. Baseline information on incoming students was collected during the first year of the study; complete information will be available at the end of the study, when outcome information can be collected and the two sets of data compared.

Goals 3 and 4, feasibility of the use of small samples, were met during the first year of the study using comparisons between sample and statewide demographic data. These comparisons made on age, sex, and ethnic status showed that sample data and statewide census data were sufficiently close to support the argument that sample data could produce information equivalent to statewide census data.

Goal 5, factors inhibiting Limited English-Speaking and Non-English-Speaking students cannot be met completely because of the small numbers of the latter in the sample. Data concerning the difficulties encountered by the former group were collected during the first year of the study and reported in the Statewide Longitudinal Study Report 1978-79, Part I. Further information on these problems will be included in the current report.

Goal 6, collection of information on difficulties encountered by disadvantaged or handicapped students, displaced homemakers, and those in programs non-traditional for their sex cannot be met completely. Information was collected on problems encountered by these groups, but it was found that some of them exist in the sample in numbers too small for generalization.

Goals 5 and 6 are more completely addressed in this report than in previous reports. With respect to Ethnic groups, Financially Disadvantaged, and Educationally Disadvantaged, sufficient time has elapsed to report meaningfully on the academic and job records of these groups. Though the numbers in the other special groups are too small for generalization, it is possible to provide information about these groups through anecdotes reduced to problem and solution categories. This information is offered as a useful first step in examining these groups more completely in future studies.

STUDENT PROTOTYPES

After a year and a half of participating in the study, the project management and the consortium have evolved an additional objective:

> 7. To develop and define prototypes of community college students that will permit a description of the educational acitivities in which California Community Colleges are engaged.

Discussion of 15 tentatively identified prototypes was included in the Statewide Longitudinal Study 1978-79 Report, Part 2. These prototypes were further refined during the academic year 1979-80. Prototyping of all students in the sample was done during Spring 1980 data collection, and has been partially described above. Data on the prototypes is given in Chapter 3 of this report.

Chapter 2

Spring 1980 Data Results

For the Spring 1980 data collection, 41.5 percent of the sample were "warehoused," or temporarily eliminated from the group receiving a structured interview. The consortium had decided that no useful information could be obtained from former students who had been interviewed at least once since they left the participating college and had not re-enrolled since that interview. These students were not interviewed in Spring 1980.

As a consequence, the number of subjects on whom data interview variables are reported is small compared with previous reports. Though the warehoused subjects were not interviewed, and, by definition, have no additional academic data from college records, they were assigned Primary Course Type, Secondary Course Type, First and Second Prototype, and Prototype Confidence Levels.

Questions for Spring 1980 interviews vary for different types of sample members. Academic and work variables were collected on all students and former students interviewed. However, depending on the reason for the student attending college, different questions were asked. There were three sets of questions, one for Transfer Students, one for Vocational Students, and one for Special Interest Students, in addition to questions common to all regarding employment status, educational goals, etc.

This chapter has four sections. The first is a report of demographic, enrollment, academic, and work variables on all students not warehoused. The second contains information on Transfer Students, the third on Vocational Students, and the fourth on Special Interest Students.

Demographic Variables: Tables 2-1 through 2-6 contain data on all students in the sample. Table 2-1 shows the distribution of the sample by Sex. These data have been reported previously and are provided as reminders. Fourty-four percent are male, 56 percent female.

Table 2-1. Sex

	Frequency	Percentage
Male	3127	43.8
Female	4012	56.2
Total	7139*	

*N-sizes for record data are larger than those for interview data

The distribution of AGE is shown in Table 2-2 below. These data have also been reported previously. After two years, the values are not the same as for the California Community College population as a whole. Because the original sample consisted of first-time admittees only, the original distribution was low by about one year. The figures below are high by a year when compared with the population as a whole.

Table 2-2. Age as of Spring 1980

	Frequency	Percentage
Under 20	278	3.9
20 thru 24	3826	53.5
25 thru 29	972	13.6
30 thru 34	710	9.9
35 thru 39	406	5.7
40 thru 44	315	4.4
45 thru 49	242	3.4
50 thru 54	151	2.1
55 thru 59	116	1.6
60 thru 65	65	0.9
65 or over	70	1.0
Total	7151	

Mean = 28.8
Median = 23.7
Mode = 20

Proportions of each ethnic group are shown in Table 2-3 below. Comparing these figures with the Fall 1978 figures, there has been a 17.5 percent increase in the proportion of Blacks in attendance, and a 5.6 percent increase in the proportion of Hispanics in attendance. The proportion of Whites in the sample has declined slightly.

Table 2-3. Ethnicity

	Frequency	Percentage
American Indian or Alaska Native	68	1.1
Asian or Pacific Islands	428	6.6
Black	607	9.4
Hispanic	848	13.1
White	4370	67.6
Other	140	2.2
Declined to State	693	
Total	7154	

Academic Variables: Table 2-4 below shows the semester-to-semester pattern of enrollment for the students in the study. In all, eight possible enrollment patterns are shown. The modal attendance pattern is one semester only (34.3 percent). The next is continuous attendance over the four semesters (27.7 percent). The third is continuous enrollment for two semesters only (19.8 percent).

Table 2-4. Enrollment Patterns

Fall '78	Spring '79	Fall '79	Spring '80	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	No	No	No	2453	34.3
Yes	Yes	No	No	1413	19.8
Yes	Yes	Yes	No	671	9.4
Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	1976	27.7
Yes	No	No	Yes	127	1.8
Yes	No	Yes	No	154	2.2
Yes	No	Yes	Yes	157	2.2
Yes	Yes	No	Yes	191	2.7
Total				7142	

A study of the Prototypes in the next chapter may help explain this. A very high percentage of students, possibly as high as 40 percent attend for short-term reasons only. These are Expediters (those who are picking up credits while attending a four-year college), Job Seekers (those who only want minimal job skills), Job Upgraders (those who only wish to increase job skills), License Maintainers (those who take one course to renew a license), Leisure Skills Students (those who seek skills for home or hobby), and Lateral Transfer Students (those who take preliminary courses before transferring to another community college or vocational institution elsewhere).

About 9 percent of the sample have "sporadic attendance" for the first four semesters. This means they had at least one break in their attendance. It is expected that this proportion of sporadic attendance will increase considerably when data from academic year 1980-81 are examined.

Table 5 gives the distribution of GRADE POINT AVERAGE. This is one of the few distributions that is not distorted by extreme skewness (mean 2.7, median 2.7, mode 2.5). Ungrouped data show that there is in essence a tri-modal distribution: 11.2 percent had a grade point average of 2.0, 14.7 percent had 3.0, and 10.0 percent had 4.0. This is probably an artifact of the large number of sample subjects who finished but one course.

Table 2-5. Grade Point Average

0-.9	1-1.9	2-2.9	3-3.9	4
%	%	%	%	%
3.3	11.7	40.3	34.7	10.2

Total N 7157

Table 2-6 shows the distributions of UNITS PASSED, UNITS ATTEMPTED, COURSES PASSED, and GPA. As previously reported, about 24 percent of the initial sample attempted and passed zero courses, had zero units, and 27 percent had zero grade points. Zero is the modal number in this table. The mean, median, and mode figures shown were exclusive of zero.

The percentage of UNITS PASSED, UNITS ATTEMPTED, COURSES PASSED, and GRADE POINTS decline as the intervals increase, i.e. a larger proportion of the sample passed 1-5 units than 6-10 units. All four of these distributions have an extreme positive skew. Since these are cumulative over three semesters (5 quarters), the positive skew is expected. The mean number of UNITS ATTEMPTED and UNITS PASSED is slightly more than 17, but the median

Table 2-6. Academic Record Data

#	Units Passed	Units Attempted	Courses Passed	#	Grade Points	
	%	%	%			%
0	24.6	24.2	24.2	*	0	27.1
1-5	20.3	19.8	41.4	*	1-10	14.2
6-10	13.5	13.5	15.5	*	11-20	11.1
11-15	8.1	8.1	11.3	*	21-30	8.5
16-20	5.5	5.8	5.5	*	31-40	6.1
21-25	5.6	5.9	1.2	*	41-50	4.6
26-30	5.2	5.5	.2	*	51-60	4.4
31-35	4.4	4.3		*	61-70	3.6
36-40	4.7	4.9		*	71-80	3.2
41-45	3.3	3.5		*	81-90	3.3
46-50	2.0	1.8		*	91-100	2.8
51-55	1.1	1.0		*	101 +	11.0
56-60	.5	.5		*		
Mean*	17.1	17.2	6.6	*		49.8
Median*	12.6	12.9	4.6	*		34.7
Mode*	3.0	3.0	1.0	*		7.0

*Excluding zero

Total N 7157

is about 13, and the mode is 3. The mean number of COURSES PASSED is 6.7, the median 4.7, and the mode 1. The ungrouped data distribution (not shown) shows that almost 40 percent of the initial sample that were enrolled in Fall 1978 passed either one or no courses.

Data on Non-Warehoused Students: The results given in the remainder of this chapter are from interview data. Consequently, the number of responses is considerably less than that reported in the first six tables. Tables 2-7 through 2-11 contain data on all students.

In Table 2-7 below are the REASONS FOR ATTENDANCE given by students interviewed. Transfer function accounted for 31.2 percent, Vocational 45.2 percent, and Special Interest 23.7 percent. As will be noted in Chapter 3, the Transfer and Vocational functions are not mutually exclusive categories because almost 8 percent of students classified under the Student Accountability Model (SAM) (Gold, 1978) as vocational are taking vocational courses with transfer credit and intend to transfer. The results above must be interpreted with that *caveat* in mind.

Table 2-7. Reasons for Attendance

Transfer	Vocational	Special Interest
%	%	%
31.2	45.2	23.7

N = 1223

Work Variables: Table 2-8 below shows the JOB SKILL LEVEL of the students. These findings are a result of the skewed distribution of AGE already discussed. Because the younger students are more likely to have remained in college than the older, the age distribution of those interviewed is likely to have an even more positive skew than the original sample. More than 40 percent of the students are holding either Unskilled or Semi-Skilled jobs, and only 23 percent hold Skilled jobs. Seventeen percent listed themselves as Students, Unemployed. Only 5.6 percent hold Professional/Supervisory jobs.

Table 2-8. Job Skill Level

Un-Skilled	Semi-Skilled	Skilled	Professional Supervisory	Commercial	Other	Home-Maker	Student Un-Employed	Not-Student Un-Employed
%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
8.4	32.4	23.1	5.6	3.6	0.9	4.9	17.1	4.1

N = 2476

CHANGE IN SKILL LEVEL OF JOB is in Table 9 below. A very small percentage (4.1 percent) hold jobs involving less skill than in the previous semester. The majority (69 percent) hold Same Skill Level jobs, and 27 percent hold jobs requiring more skill.

Like JOB SKILL LEVEL, the distribution of HOURLY PAY, shown in Table 10 below, is influenced by the positively skewed distribution of AGE of the interviewed subjects. A little more than

Table 2-9. Change in Skill Level of Job

Less Skill	Same Skill	More Skill
%	%	%
4.1	69.0	27.0

N = 1469

Table 2-10. Hourly Pay

0-2.49	2.50-3.49	3.50-4.49	4.50-5.49	5.50-6.49	6.50-7.49	7.50+
%	%	%	%	%	%	%
0.3	18.5	26.2	18.5	10.0	6.6	19.9

N = 1413

63 percent of the sample make less than $5.50 per hour. (Note that $5.50 an hour for a 40-hour work week is $11,440 per year.) Only 20 percent of students make more than $7.50 per hour ($15,600 per year).

Table 11 below shows the distribution of PAY CHANGE for students since the last data collection. A small percentage (6.5 percent) received less pay, almost half (48 percent) received the same pay, and 45 percent received more pay than previously.

Table 2-11. Pay Change

Less Pay	Same Pay	More Pay*
%	%	%
6.5	48.3	45.2

*Excludes cost-of-living increases

N = 1413

TRANSFER STUDENT RATINGS

This section contains data on Transfer Students. A distinction is made between Transferred Students (those already in baccalaureate-granting institutions) and Transfer Students (those still attending a community college. Transferred students were asked the COLLEGE CURRENTLY ATTENDING, and HOW WELL PREPARED FOR WORK AT COLLEGE. Transfer Students still in residence were asked for the COLLEGE TRANSFERRING TO, SEMESTERS TO COMPLETE BEFORE TRANSFER, and PROGRESS MADE TOWARD TRANSFER.

Colleges attended by transferred students are shown in Table 12 below. The largest percentage (42 percent) were attending colleges in the California State University and College system, and 17 percent a campus of the University of California system. About 16 percent went either to a private Califoroia college or an out-of-state college. A surprisingly large group, 24 percent, are attending other than the above or a professional school. This last finding is surprising and deserves further scrutiny.

Table 2-12. Transferred Students: Colleges Currently Attending

	Frequency	Percentage
University of California	21	17.1
California State University	52	42.3
Private California College	10	8.1
Out of State College	10	8.1
Professional School	2	1.6
Other	28	22.8
Total	123	

Students who had already transferred were asked to rate on an A-F grade scale their preparation in their community college (Table 13 below). More than 70 percent rated their preparation as either an A or a B, 20 percent as C, and very small percentages as D or F.

Table 2-13. Transfer Students: How Well Prepared for Work at College

	Frequency	Percentage
A	35	35.7
B	38	38.8
C	20	20.4
D	4	4.1
F	1	1.0
Total	98	

Transfer Students in residence were asked to which college they planned to transfer (Table 14 below). More than half (56 percent) intended to transfer to the California State University system, and 15 percent to the University of California. Nineteen percent were Unsure, and 9 percent wanted to attend either a private California college or an out-of-state college. Only 0.7 percent wanted to attend an "other" institution; puzzling, considering the findings in Table 12 above.

Table 2-14. Transfer Students: College Transferring To

	Frequency	Percentage
Unsure	176	18.7
University of California	138	14.7
California State University	528	56.1
Private California College	54	5.7
Out of State College	34	3.6
Professional School	4	0.4
Other	7	0.7
Total	941	

Students were asked how many semesters they felt it would be before they transferred. The results are in Table 15 below. Note that most of the students asked this question had attended for four semesters, including the current one. To obtain estimates of time students take to transfer, add three semesters to the figures shown below. Almost one third expect to transfer at the end of their fourth semester ("One"). Almost 27 percent

Table 2-15. Transfer Students: Semesters Completed Before Transfer*

	Frequency	Percentage
Unsure-undecided	109	12.2
One	285	31.8
Two	241	26.9
Three	175	19.5
Four	70	7.8
Five	16	1.8
Total	896	

*Additional semesters. Add three to numbers shown for total semesters before transfer

said that it would take five semesters for them to graduate, and 20 percent expected to take six. These data indicate that the "community college myth" of the two-year transfer function is just that. More than two thirds of those interviewed expect to take more than four semesters to graduate.

Transfer Students still in residence were also asked to rate how well they had progressed toward their transfer (Table 16 below). More than 90 percent felt that they had made either Excellent or Adequate progress. Only 9 percent felt that they had made no progress at all. This may well represent residual of the prototype Unmotivated Transfer Student described in Chapter 3.

Table 2-16. Transfer Students: Progress Made Toward a Transfer

	Frequency	Percentage
No progress	84	8.8
Adequate progress	529	55.6
Excellent progress	338	35.5
Total	951	

VOCATIONAL STUDENT RATINGS

This section contains data on Vocational Students.

Data

These students were asked MOST IMPORTANT REASON FOR ATTENDING, whether COURSES RELATED TO WORK, whether COURSES STUDIED HELPFUL ON THE JOB, whether COURSES STUDIED HELPFUL IN GETTING RAISES, and whether COURSES STUDIED HELPFUL IN GETTING PROMOTION.

Table 17 below shows the responses of Vocational Students on their most important reasons for attending. More than 84 percent listed First Career Job and Upgrading Job Skills as their most

Table 2-17. Vocational Students: Most Important Reason for Attending

Reason	Frequency	Percent
First career job	757	54.0
Upgrade job skills	418	29.8
Maintain license	45	3.2
Evening or weekend job	10	0.7
Second career job	173	12.3
Total	1403	

important reason for attending. The skewed distribution of AGE probably accounts for the 54 percent preparing for First Career Job. Data collected on prototypes indicate that many students have returned to the same college to increase their level of skills.

Table 18 below contains the data on COURSES RELATED TO WORK. Sixty-five percent reported that the courses were either Somewhat or a Great Deal related to their current job. It is surprising that 35 percent reported that the courses related Not At All. Some of these students were Second Careerists (12 percent from Table 17 above). It is not possible to explain the remaining 22 percent. It is possible that some were preparing for a promotion or for some other aspect of work in their field, e.g. the self-employed mechanic who took accounting courses to assist him in the management of his business.

Table 2-18. Vocational Students: Courses Related to Work

Work Related Courses	Frequency	Percentage
Not at all	418	34.9
Somewhat	317	26.5
A great deal	463	38.6
Total	1198	

Table 19 below containing data on where COURSES STUDIED (were) HELPFUL IN GETTING JOBS contains some surprises. Only 39 percent indicated that the courses were helpful either Somewhat or A

Great Deal. Sixty-one percent reported that they were Not At All helpful. The response to the question ("Did the things you learned in your courses help you get a job?) was student attribution of cause, and it is possible that many of them felt that their own ability to sell themselves was the crucial factor in obtaining jobs. Many may have had their jobs before starting college. Table 17 shows that 54 percent of students were training for First Career Jobs, and 30 percent for job skill upgrading purposes. Additionally, Table 18 shows that 35 percent of students are taking vocational courses which do not relate to their current jobs. These data indicate that vocational courses are often tangential to the central focus of a student's job and would not be likely to contribute to job attainment.

Table 2-19. Vocational Students: Courses Studied Helpful in Getting Jobs

	Frequency	Percentage
Not at all	633	61.3
Somewhat	185	17.9
A great deal	215	20.8
Total	1033	

Answers to the question about whether courses studied were HELPFUL ON THE JOB are in Table 20 below. Eighty-three percent reported that their courses were helpful either Somewhat or a Great Deal. The balance may be inferred to consist of Second Careerists or students studying for skills which are tangential to their jobs.

Table 2-20. Vocational Students: Courses Studied Helpful on Job

Courses Studied Helpful on Job	Frequency	Percentage
Not at all	280	27.0
Somewhat	349	33.7
A great deal	407	39.3
Total	1036	

Table 21 below contains data on student report on the extent to which COURSES STUDIED HELPFUL IN GETTING PAY RAISES. Approximately 32 percent reported that their courses were helpful either Somewhat or A Great Deal. The balance reported that their courses were not at all helpful. In view of the fact that 83 percent found that their courses were helpful on the job, it is apparent that variables other than job skill must affect raises.

Table 2-21. Vocational Students:
Courses Studied Helpful in Getting Pay Raises

	Frequency	Percentage
Not at all	623	68.2
Somewhat	164	18.0
A great deal	126	13.8

Table 22 below shows the extent to which students found that their courses were HELPFUL IN GETTING PROMOTION. As with getting raises, a large percentage (74 percent) reported that they did not, and the balance reported that course information was helpful. As with data in Table 21 above, it seems that variables other than skills gained in courses account for obtaining promotion on the job.

Table 2-22. Vocational Students:
Courses Studied Helpful in Getting Promotion

	Frequency	Percentage
Not at all	670	74.2
Somewhat	124	13.7
A great deal	109	12.1
Total	903	

Table 23 below shows the proportion of interviewed Vocational Students interested in college credit for their work. In considering the finding that 85 percent stated interest, the reader is reminded that the responses are from those interviewed--and perhaps likely to be among those planning to finish a program. In the total sample 27 percent of Vocational Students are either Job Seekers or Job Upgraders (See Chapter 3), and these students often leave when short-term goals are met. Some may have given socially approved responses or made the decision more on the spot than beforehand to drop a course once goals are met.

Table 2-23. Vocational Students:

Importance of Getting Credit for Class

	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	1204	85.6
Unsure	50	3.6
No	153	10.9
Total	1407	

Table 24 below contains the proportion of vocational students not enrolled who plan to return to their community college. Seventy-five percent said that they would either definitely or probably return, and 10 percent were Undecided. Only 7 percent said Probably Not, and 8 percent gave a definite No.

Table 2-24. Vocational Students:

Future Courses Planned at College

	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	345	52.8
Yes, Probably	146	22.4
Undecided	66	10.1
Probably Not	45	6.9
No	51	7.8
Total	653	

Discussion

The most frequent function that California community colleges perform for Vocational Students is preparation for First Career Jobs or Upgrading Job Skills. Of the 54 percent preparing for First Career Jobs, only a small proportion are planning to complete a vocational program (see Chapter 3); most of the 80 percent of Vocational Students with First Career Job and Job Upgrading goals attend for short-term reasons (Table 17). Approximately 65 percent take courses either Somewhat or A Great Deal related to their jobs, and 73 percent found that their courses were helpful on the job. The proportion of students who found that their courses were helpful in obtaining jobs, raises or promotions was smaller. Thirty-eight percent found courses Helpful in getting jobs, 32 percent in getting raises and 26 percent in getting promotions. Three quarters of the students plan to return for more courses, and 86 percent state that getting credit is important.

SPECIAL INTEREST STUDENTS

This section contains the data on Special Interest Students.

Data

Special Interest Students are pursuing goals which do not involve either transfer or job training. Some want hobby skills, some want academic enrichment, some seek recreation, some study basic skills courses, and others are taking preliminary courses before transferring to a special program in another community college.

Table 25 below shows the proportion of students who fall into these categories. Almost half (44 percent) seek skills in vocational, sports or artistic areas. About a third (33 percent) seek general education, and 6.6 percent are taking cultural courses, e.g. music appreciation, art history. About 11 percent seek personal development, taking courses which apply directly or indirectly to personal growth.

Table 2-25. Special Interest Students: Courses Most Interested In

	Frequency	Percentage
Vocational skills	140	23.1
Sport skills	53	8.7
Arts, crafts, musical skills	71	11.7
General culture	40	6.6
General education	201	33.2
Personal development	65	10.7
Other response	36	5.9
Total	606	

A surprisingly high percentage (65 percent) indicated an interest in getting credit for their courses (Table 26). As with Vocational Students (Table 23), it is possible that many students gave a socially correct answer which may not reflect behavior.

In Table 27 below are the proportions of Special Interest Students who plan future courses at their colleges. Seventy-one percent said that they either definitely or probably will return for future courses. Seventeen percent were undecided, and only 13 percent said that they would probably or definitely not return.

Table 2-26. Special Interest Students: Importance of Getting Credit for Class

	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	549	64.7
Unsure	58	6.8
No	242	28.5
Total	849	

Table 2-27. Special Interest Students: Future Courses Planned

	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	168	43.0
Yes, Probably	109	27.9
Undecided	65	16.6
Probably Not	28	7.2
No	21	5.4
Total	391	

Table 28 below shows the proportion of Special Interest Students who felt that they had met their goals at college. Eighty-one percent felt that they had met their goals either completely or or partially, and only 19 percent felt that they had not met them. These data do not indicate the extent to which the college may be responsible for unmet goals. Many interviewees who indicated they had not met their goals volunteered the statement, "But it was my fault, not the college's!"

Table 2-28. Special Interest Students:
Goals Met While Attending College

	Frequency	Percentage
Yes, completely	135	38.6
Yes, partially	150	42.9
Not at all	65	18.6
Total	350	

Discussion

More than 43 percent of Special Interest Students interviewed sought hobby skills in their college work, 23 percent in vocational areas. Forty percent were interested in general education or culture courses. A surprisingly high percentage (65 percent) said that they were interested in obtaining college credit for their work. There is some question from other data whether they uniformly seek to obtain this credit. More than 70 percent intend to return for additional courses at their colleges. More than 80 percent felt that they had met their goals either partially or completely.

Chapter 3

Student Prototypes

For decades it has been assumed that the California Community Colleges have offered three major "curricula": a two-year lower-division Transfer Program, a one-year certificate or two-year Occupational Degree Program, and a general smorgasbord of Leisure Time or lifelong learning courses. Data from the first two semesters of the SLS made it obvious that these classifications were inadequate to describe the educational experiences offered by California Community Colleges to their students. It was further evident that (1) students are chiefly concerned with courses and skills rather than programs, (2) students frequently have personal goals relating to events outside the college (e.g. jobs, raises and promotions rather than grades and credits), and (3) many students have only minimal interest in obtaining formal transcript credit for their work.

The first attempt at defining the mission of California Community Colleges by means of Student Prototypes was published in Part 2 of the SLS Report, covering Spring 1979 data. Fifteen prototypes were identified and assigned facetious names, but were described operationally in terms of the variables that could be collected in making prototype assignments. During Fall 1979 these prototype definitions were honed by a subset of coordinators from six of the participating colleges. This list, with detailed instructions for assigning sample subjects to Prototypes, was published in the SLS Prototyping Manual, Spring 1980.

COURSE TYPES

Part of the prototyping process involved determining the "most prevalent course type" taken by the student. This determination bore no relationship either to the declared major of the student or to the major given by students in telephone interviews. Statements of major frequently were not reflected in the courses undertaken by students.

General Education Courses are in foreign languages, social sciences, literature, mathematics, and science. They normally carry transfer credit to CSUC and/or UC.

Vocational Skill Courses are designed to enable students to earn their living in the area of training. They include areas such as typing, bookkeeping, automechanics, nursing, horticulture, etc.

Culture Courses are in art, music, or entertainment areas. They are observer-oriented rather than skill-oriented, e.g. music appreciation, art history, contemporary theater. They often include spectator events such as concerts, plays, visits to museums, etc.

Artistic Skill Courses teach specific skills in the music or art areas. Examples are instrumental music lessons, sculpture, ceramics, painting, etc.

Physical Education Skill Courses are individual sport skills such as swimming, racquetball, tennis, etc. They do not include team sports.

Personal Development Courses focus on the individual taking the course. They include assertion training, yoga, vocational guidance, personal development courses. Some courses in psychology may be included under this category.

Basic Skills Courses are in basic mathematics, reading, English composition, and speech. They are the remedial courses needed by students meeting GED requirements or recent immigrants seeking to develop English language skills.

PROTOTYPE DEFINITIONS

The Student Prototypes are descriptors based on the students aspirations, course enrollment and completion patterns, grades earned, student age, skill level of job held, hourly wage, and responses to early interview questions. Assigning students to prototypes often requires some systematic intuition on the part of the college coordinator.

The 18 Prototypes are divided by function, the Tansfer Function (for those whose chief goal is transfer), the Vocational Function (for those whose chief goal is directly job-related), and the Special Interest Function (for those whose goals are directed toward self rather than other educational institutions or employment.)

The 18 Prototypes are described below:

TRANSFER FUNCTION

The following types of transfer students are subsumed under the Transfer Function.

Full-Time Transfer Students want an AB or BS degree, attend full-time, obtain a GPA of better than 2.4, and will transfer after one to five semesters.

Part-Time Transfer Students want an AB or BS degree, attend part-time, and will transfer after more than five semesters.

Undisciplined Transfer Students claim AB or BS as their goal but have a poor academic record. They tend to sign up for a number of courses, drop most of them, may pass one academic course and get a grade in Physical Education. They may attend several semesters with no break in this pattern.

Technical Transfer Students intend to transfer, but take a sequence of vocational courses that have transfer credit. They would be classified as Vocational Students under the SAM (Gold, 1978) but would be mis-classified under the Vocational Function.

Intercollegiate Athletes attend college to participate in intercollegiate team athletics. They state that they are transfer students, but appear more interested in the sport than in an AB or BS degree.

Financial Aid-Seeking Students state that their goal is to transfer, but their main purpose is to obtain financial aid for as long as possible. Serious students on financial aid do not fall into this category.

Expediter Students are attending a nearby four-year college and take one or two courses at community college because it "fits into their schedules."

VOCATIONAL FUNCTION

The following kinds of students are subsumed under the Vocational Function.

(Technical Transfer Students)

As defined above.

Career Program Completers are one or two-year vocational students intending to take the complete series of courses in a vocational program preparatory to working in the field of study.

Job Seekers want only enough skills for a beginning job in their chosen field. They attend part-time, and may not complete courses once they have learned enough skills for the job they want. They usually enroll in one or two courses in the same field for one or two semesters.

Job Upgraders hold a job in their chosen career, attend part-time, usually evenings, to upgrade their job skills. They generally seek a promotion or raise or to get a better job in the same field. They may not complete courses once their goals have been met.

Second Career Students already have a job in their chosen career and seek skills for a second career or for "moonlighting." They generally attend part-time and evenings.

License Maintainers generally take one course, for credit, to renew a license. They generally attend part-time, evenings.

SPECIAL INTEREST FUNCTION

The following types of students are subsumed under the Special Interest Function. The reader will find that the first four are interest in self-enrichment and that the last two have interests which may or will lead to further educational endeavors.

Leisure Skills Students seek vocational, athletic, or aesthetic skills to pursue a hobby. They usually enroll in one course per semester, often in the evenings.

Education Seekers are "perpetual learners," those whose life is not complete unless they are taking a college course, usually in the liberal arts.

Art and Culture Students are "culture buffs;" they take courses in music appreciation, art history, or humanities courses that include attendance at concerts, art exhibits, drama productions, etc.

Explorer/Experimenter Students don't know exactly what they want and are exploring avenues of content or exploring themselves before deciding how/whether to continue their education.

Basic Skills Students seek basic skills in math, reading, and English composition. They are often students seeking a GED or recent immigrants wanting to learn English.

Lateral Transfer Students are taking preliminary courses in their local community college before transferring to a specialized program not given locally.

PROTOTYPING

The original prototypes, as defined by the subset of the consortium, were used as part of the Spring 1980 data collection process. Formative evaluation continued during the spring as additional Prototypes emerged from the data and others were redefined. These additions and changes were disseminated to college coordinators. The final list of Prototypes was that given above.

After assigning each student to a prototype, college coordinators indicated how confident they were that students belonged in the group to which they were assigned. The range of confidence was indicated on a three-point "comfort scale." This was defined as follows:

1. Uncomfortable; there is not a good fit between the college record and interview data and the most likely prototype;

contradictions exist in the data.

2. Moderately comfortable; there is a good fit between most of the data and the most likely prototype, though some contradictions may exist.
3. Very comfortable; there is a good fit between all variables and the most likely prototype.

In summary, as part of the data collection for Spring 1980, coordinators made five judgments about each person in the sample:

1. Primary Most Prevalent Course Type
2. Secondary Most Prevalent Course Type
3. First (Most Likely) Prototype
4. Second (if necessary) possible Prototype
5. Comfort with assignments.

In 58 percent of cases, college coordinators felt Very Comfortable with prototypes, 30 percent felt Moderately Comfortable, and 12 percent Uncomfortable. In less than 2 percent of cases was the coordinator unable to assign a Prototype.

Intercoordinator reliability studies performed within and between colleges showed that there was about 85 percent agreement between coordinators. These reliability studies indicate that the Prototype Manual supplied to all colleges provided sufficient decision rules for the job.

In academic year 1980-81, students were read descriptions of the First Prototype assigned, and asked if they agreed that the description fit them. Preliminary analysis of data shows that 88 percent agreed, 5 percent said that the prototype fit at the time it was made, but that their goals had changed; and only 7 percent said that the prototype had been assigned in error.

FINDINGS

Frequency distributions on prototypes are in Tables 3-1 through 3-5 below. The reader is reminded that the percentages reported are not the proportions of those attending community colleges but rather the proportion of those who initially enrolled in Fall 1978.

Table 3-1. Transfer, Vocational, and Special Interest Functions

	Frequency	Percentage*
Transfer Function	2548	35.6
Vocational Function	2534	35.5
Special Interest Function	1907	26.6
No Prototype Assigned	168	2.0
Totals	7157	

In Table 3-1 above, Technical Transfer Students are included in Transfer Function because, though they take vocational courses, their purpose is to earn a BS degree before seeking a job in their chosen field. The percentages in Transfer and Vocational functions are equal, 36 percent in each. The Special Interest function proportion is smaller, 27 percent.

Table 3-2 shows the percentages of each Prototype in the sample. Overall, about 25 percent of the students are serious transfer students (combining Full-Time Transfer, Part-Time Transfer, and Technical Transfer Students). About 28 percent are short-term Vocational Skills Students (combining Job Seeking and Improving Job Skills Students).

The reader is advised to spend several minutes examining Table 3-2. These data reflect, more than any ever collected, the current function of California Community Colleges.

Table 3-2. Student Prototypes by Percentage

	Frequency	Percentage
Full-Time Transfer Student	701	10.0
Part-Time Transfer Student	490	7.0
Transfer/Technical Major	555	7.9
Undisciplined Transfer	687	9.8
Expediter	55	0.8
Intercollegiate Athlete (claims transfer goal)	28	0.4
Financial Support Seeker (claims transfer goal)	32	0.5
Vocational Career Program Completer	345	4.9
Job Seeker	1153	16.5
Improving Job Skills Student	793	11.3
Second Careerist	204	2.9
License Maintainer	39	0.6
Leisure Skills Student (takes Vocational courses)	813	11.6
Education Seeker	471	6.7
Art and Culture Student	92	1.3
Explorer/Experimenter	220	3.1
Basic Skills Student (math and reading, chiefly)	265	3.8
Lateral Transfer Student	46	0.7
No Prototype Assigned	168	Missing
Total	7157	

It is obvious that California Community Colleges are neither "two-year transfer institutions" nor "two-year vocational education institutions " but something very different. Only 25 percent are serious transfer students, and of these 8 percent are taking vocational courses and programs. About 7 percent will take considerably more than two years to transfer. Only 5 percent plan to take a full vocational program; 28 percent have short-term job-oriented goals. The balance (42 percent) fall into 12 of the 18 prototype categories developed.

Table 3-3. Transfer Prototypes by Percentage

	Frequency	Percentage
Full-Time Transfer Students	701	27.5
Part-Time Transfer Students	490	19.2
Transfer/Technical Majors	555	21.8
Undisciplined Transfer	687	27.0
Expediter	55	2.2
Intercollegiate Athlete	28	1.0
Financial Support Seeker	32	1.3
Total	2548	

Table 3-3 above shows the proportions in each Prototype among Transfer Students only (36 percent of the total sample). Of these, 68.5 percent are serious transfer students. Only 27.5 percent, however, fit the stereotypical "two-year transfer student," and there is reasonable doubt that all of these will transfer in two years.

Twenty-seven percent of the Transfer group pose a serious problem for college administrators. These are students who probably did not do well in high school, and their enrollment patterns and academic achievement make it doubtful that they have the capacity or self-discipline to transfer. They are plainly problem students, and there is need for special programs to help them.

Table 3-4. Vocational Function by Percentage

	Frequency	Percentage
Vocational Program Completer	345	13.6
Job Seeker	1153	45.5
Job Upgrader	793	31.3
Second Careerist	204	8.1
License Maintainer	39	1.5
Total	2534	

Table 3-4 above shows the proportions in each Prototype among Vocational Students only (36 percent of the sample). More than three quarters of them (76.8 percent) have short-term goals that relate directly and immediately to jobs. Only 13.6 percent fit the stereotype of the "certificate or degree vocational student." These data show that the bulk of vocational education in California Community Colleges is concerned with job-related short-term goals. Furthermore, with the exception of the Vocational Program Completer and the License Maintainer (15 percent of Vocational Students), many may not be interested in grades or college credit.

Table 3-5 below contains the distribution of Special Interest Students (27 percent of the sample). Almost half (43 percent) of them want hobby skills, some of which are vocational. A quarter of them are in lifelong education. Fourteen percent seek remediation in basic skill areas, and 12 percent are not sure what they want. This last group ranks in importance with the Undisciplined Transfer student because they, too, may need special programs to help them discover and develop educational and career goals.

Table 3-5. Special Interest Function by Percentage

	Frequency	Percentage
Leisure Skills Student	813	42.6
Education Seeker	471	24.7
Art and Culture Student	92	4.8
Explorer/Experimenter	220	11.5
Basic Skills Student	265	13.9
Lateral Transfer Student	46	2.4
Total	1907	

DISCUSSION

The most important of the findings is the unexpected picture they provide about the educational experiences provided by California Community Colleges. It is now possible to define the different functions using categories that are mutually exclusive.

For example, it is now possible to make definitive statements about Vocational Students. Earlier models for describing students used Declared Major, which was useless because of the frequent poor fit between Major and courses enrolled in. Even using vocational courses to describe students often results in error because students have a variety of reasons for making such choices. The prototype method provides a useful supplement to the classification described by the SAM system. First, it separates out Technical Transfer Majors, who would score high on the SAM Matrix but who are not Vocational Students. Second, it separates out Leisure Skill Students, some of whom take vocational courses for purely personal (non-occupation-oriented) reasons. Third, it avoids the "Completer" and "Leaver" judgmental trap because it establishes that many "Leavers" leave for the most positive of reasons--they met their goals. Last, it establishes that many students have vocational goals that do not require program completion.

These data establish that a very small percentage of students enroll in or identify with programs. Only the Full-Time Transfer, the Part-Time Transfer, the Transfer Technical Major, and the Vocational Career Program Completer (29.8 percent of the sample) might be so interested, and many of the Transfer prototypes might take less than full programs. Considering this finding community college managers ought to engage in different kinds of curriculum planning.

Additionally, these data show that a large proportion of students are probably not concerned either with grades or with course credit. Only the serious Transfer Prototypes, the Vocational

Career Program Completers, the License Maintainers and the Lateral Transfer Students (31.9 percent of the sample) actually need college credit to meet their goals. This may help to explain the high proportion of Ws given. It is probable that many Ws represent students who attended without any expectation of obtaining grades or credit. These findings indicate that college administrations ought to find an alternate method of judging course outcomes. Because students are free to enter and leave at will, community colleges will suffer needless and unfair criticism on account of the large numbers of students who withdraw without credit, yet whose goals have been met. It is also possible that the ADA system of community college financing deserves review as the ADA method assumes that students plan to complete courses.

Last, a very small percentage of students fit the two-year stereotype most educators and lay persons believe describe community colleges. At most 18 percent of the sample are two-year Transfer Students, and 5 percent are two-year vocational students. California Community Colleges are not "two-year colleges," and it is time that that latter expression go out of fashion.

Of the 36 percent of students who were Transfer Students, only 28 percent were full-time, taking academic courses, 20 percent were part-time, and 22 percent were following a vocational curriculum with transfer credit. Only 68.5 percent may realistically be considered candidates for transfer. Twenty-seven percent pose serious problems for faculty and administrators because their enrollment and academic achievement patterns indicate that they have no realistic potential for transfer.

An analysis of the Vocational Function shows that vocational educators are basically in the business of providing short-term training for students who want jobs. Only 14 percent of Vocational Prototypes are interested in complete programs. Almost half (46 percent) are seeking minimal skills for entry-level employment, and almost one-third (31 percent) are seeking to increase job skills through short-term college attendance. This group is already employed in their fields of choice.

Among Special Interest Students (27 percent of the sample) more than 70 percent are Leisure Skills Students, Education Seekers, or Art Culture Students who generally enroll in no more than one course at a time and seldom care whether they receive credit for it. About 12 percent are Explorer/Experimenters, students who are unsure of goals; 14 percent are interested in Basic Skills.

Crosstabulations of prototypes with Special Student Groups (Ethnic Minorities, Financially Disadvantaged, Educationally Disadvantaged) will be found in Chapters 4, 5, and 6 of this report. Discussion of Student Prototypes as they relate to these groups will be found within those chapters.

In conclusion, this chapter contains a picture, not possible earlier, of the education obtained by California Community College students. The findings have shown that much of the popular conception of community colleges is inaccurate and misleading, that few students fit the stereotypes assumed by conventional wisdom, and that much effort must be expended to provide opinion-makers and legislators with the accurate and reliable information they need to make useful decisions about community colleges. Further, it demonstrates clearly the point made in Part 3 of the SLS Report that ". . . the mission of community colleges is determined to a far greater extent by the students than by other groups, e.g., Boards of Trustees, academic senates, college administrations . . . that the usual method of judging instructional outcomes, credits, and grades is NOT valid for students who are only interested in raises, promotions and personal satisfaction . . . If the real value of community colleges is to be assessed, supplementary procedures for`judging instructional outcomes must be developed." (pp56-7)

Chapter 4

Comparisons Among Ethnic Groups

This chapter contains comparisons on four ethnic groups, Asians, Blacks, Hispanics, and Whites. The first part of the chapter contains comparisons using the entire sample, the second part, vocational students only.

The categories "American Indian/Alaskan Native" and "Other" were omitted from the data analysis. The former was omitted because the numbers were too small for meaningful discussion, the latter because the group is heterogeneous.

The percentage of each of the four ethnic groups from each of the 15 colleges participating in the study is shown in Table 4-1. There is considerable heterogeneity among the colleges. The range for each minority group extends from less than 1 percent to more than 17 percent for Asians, less than 1 percent to greater than 30 percent for Blacks, and from 3 percent to more than 53 percent for Hispanics. In contrast, the variability of most items describing the aspirations, enrollment patterns, and achievement of students is extremely low.

Enrollment patterns are shown in Table 4-2 below. Only Blacks and Whites are similar with respect to one semester of attendance, but all groups are similar with respect to two, three, and four consecutive semesters.

Table 4-1. Ethnic Groups*

College	Asians	Blacks	Hispanics	Whites	N
	%	%	%	%	
Antelope V.	2.8	1.8	6.4	86.9	431
Bakersfield	.2	6.9	17.4	72.1	370
Cerritos	1.6	5.2	16.1	67.7	363
Contra Costa	5.8	30.3	4.1	50.6	222
El Camino	5.8	24.0	9.0	56.7	434
Foothill	8.9	3.4	5.3	79.0	486
Golden West	4.2	.4	6.5	86.1	476
Imp. Valley	1.5	2.3	55.8	37.3	223
L.A. City	17.5	30.4	21.1	21.7	351
L.A. Pierce	4.8	3.1	5.6	82.2	565
Sac. City	11.7	14.2	11.4	57.2	336
S-J Evergreen	11.9	7.4	17.4	60.6	428
Santa Ana	4.9	4.5	10.8	75.7	526
Shasta	1.0	.4	3.3	92.2	501
Southwestern	11.5	5.1	20.1	59.8	442
Total	6.7	8.9	13.1	68.4	6154

*Percentages will not add to 100; American Indians and "Other" omitted

Table 4-2. Enrollment Patterns: Consecutive Semesters

Group	One Semester	Two Semesters	Three Semesters	Four Semesters	Other	N
	%	%	%	%	%	
Asian	26.0	20.6	9.5	35.5	8.4	390
Black	33.7	19.6	10.4	26.1	10.4	500
Hispanic	29.9	18.7	11.4	31.9	8.1	783
White	32.6	20.1	9.6	28.7	9.0	4218

GRADE POINT AVERAGE

Table 4-3 below gives a distribution of GPAs and shows that white students obtained higher grades than other ethnic groups, with Asians the next highest. About one third of the Blacks received a GPA of less than 2.0, the largest percentage of the ethnic groups. However, the differences in mean GPA across the ethnic groups (Table 4-4) are not notable. Blacks and Hispanics had a lower GPA than the other two groups, but the total range was only 0.56. The major differences are to be found in the distributions given in Table 4-3.

Table 4-3. Grade Point Average

Group	0-.9	1.0-1.9	2.0-2.9	3.0-3.9	4.0	N
	%	%	%	%	%	
Asian	2.1	15.6	41.8	31.6	8.8	390
Black	10.7	23.6	42.8	18.8	4.0	500
Hispanic	3.9	17.1	50.2	24.8	4.0	783
White	2.5	8.6	38.5	38.5	11.9	4218

Table 4-4. Average GPA

Statistic	Asians	Blacks	Hispanics	Whites
	%	%	%	%
Mean	2.64	2.26	2.44	2.80
Standard Dev.	.86	.95	.80	.84

JOB INFORMATION

This section contains information on jobs held and wages earned by respondents.

Table 4-5 below gives the distribution of job skill level by ethnicity. There is a small proportion of Blacks listing themselves as holding unskilled jobs (6.4 percent), a contradiction of oft-stated opinion, as is the large proportion of Blacks holding supervisory positions.

Table 4-5. Job Level Status

Group	Un-Skilled	Semi-Skilled	Skilled	Professional	Commercial	Home maker	Student Unemp.	Not Student Unemp.	N
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	
Asian	9.9	25.9	24.7	1.9	3.1	2.5	28.4	3.7	390
Black	6.4	34.0	20.5	7.7	3.2	1.3	23.7	3.2	499
Hisp.	10.2	33.1	20.7	3.3	3.3	3.6	18.0	6.9	787
White	8.2	33.1	23.4	3.7	3.7	5.7	15.0	3.7	4218

It is a commonly-held belief that the highest proportion of unemployed is among young Blacks, and that most of those employed are in lower-status positions. Table 4-5 above presents evidence contrary to this belief, at least for Black community college students. If the employment developmental statistics on unemployment are accurate, Black community college students are not representative of the Black population in the state.

Note that Black and Asian samples have the highest percentage under "Student Not Usually Employed." Again we have evidence contrary to conventional wisdom, as this category is most often associated with the wealthy suburban white population.

These findings may be illuminated by the Statewide Longitudinal Study report for academic 1980-81. There is an item on the 1980-81 interview schedule that addresses the issue of how students finance their education.

Table 4-6, 4-7, and 4-8 report the change in job skill level, hourly wage, and change in hourly wage, respectively.

There are no dramatic differences among ethnic groups in their ability to improve the skill level of their jobs (Table 4-6). Data in Table 4-7 show that all four ethnic groups are earning an average hourly salary between $5 and $6, though the Hispanic group is significantly lower with a mean hourly wage of $5.09.

Table 4-6. Job Skill Level Change by Ethnicity

Group	Less Skill %	Same Skill %	More Skill %	N
Asian	2.0	67	31	82
Black	3.0	67	31	99
Hispanic	5	67	28	173
White	4	70	26	1065

Table 4-7. Wages by Ethnic Groups

Statistic	Asians	Blacks	Hispanics	Whites	N
	%	%	%	%	
Mean	$5.72	$5.91	$5.09	$5.79	1130
Standard Dev.	$3.07	$3.31	$2.45	$3.43	

Table 4-8. Pay Change by Ethnicity

Group	Less Pay	Same Pay	More Pay	N
	%	%	%	
Asians	5	47	48	78
Black	2	42	55	87
Hispanic	7	47	47	180
White	7	48	44	1026

There are no dramatic differences in the change in pay for the ethnic groups (Table 4-8). The greatest change is among the Black students who have a smaller proportion in the Less Pay (2 percent) and a greater percentage in the More Pay (55 percent), again a contradiction of conventional wisdom.

STUDENT PROTOTYPES

Tables 4-9, 4-10, and 4-11 below show the distribution of prototypes among the different ethnic groups. Table 4-9 contains

contains Transfer Prototypes, Table 4-10 Vocational Prototypes, and Table 4-11 Special Interest Prototypes.

Table 4-9. Transfer Prototypes

Group	Full-Time Transfer	Part-Time Transfer	Technical Transfer	Un-Disciplined Transfer	Athlete	Financial Support	Expediter
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Asian	13.1	7.0	10.3	12.2	.5	.2	.2
Black	6.3	5.6	7.1	15.8	2.7	.3	.3
Hispanic	8.4	6.1	8.0	12.1	.5	1.0	.6
White	11.6	7.8	7.4	8.8	1.7	.3	.5

Table 4-10. Vocational Prototypes

Group	Career Program Completer	Job Seeker	Job Upgrader Student	Second Career Student	License Maintainer
	%	%	%	%	%
Asian	5.6	14.1	10.1	4.5	.7
Black	3.7	20.7	8.6	3.4	.2
Hispanic	6.8	16.0	8.9	2.6	.1
White	5.1	14.0	13.2	2.9	.8

Table 4-11. Special Interest Prototypes

Group	Leisure Skills Student	Education Seeker	Art & Culture Student	Explorer/ Experimenter Student	Basic Skills Student	Lateral Transfer Student	Total N
	%	%	%	%	%	%	
Asian	6.3	5.2	.5	1.6	6.8	.9	390
Black	4.4	9.0	3.2	3.1	5.4	.2	499
Hispanic	6.7	6.8	1.6	3.1	10.1	.4	787
White	14.1	6.4	1.2	3.2	1.3	.8	4218

A smaller proportion of Blacks and Hispanics were found to be Full-Time Transfer students than Whites and Asians. A lower percentage of Whites were typed as Undisciplined Transfer Students than other groups. A related finding is that the highest percentage of Hispanics defined themselves as Educationally Disadvantaged (see Chapter 6).

A lesser percentage of Blacks than other groups were judged Career Program Completers, and a greater percentage of Blacks than other groups were Job Seekers. Blacks and Hispanics, however, do not attend community colleges to upgrade job skills as much as Whites.

Among Special Interest Students, a lesser percentage of Whites were found to be Basic Skills students than other groups.

Comparing students with transfer goals against those with vocational goals, there were no differences of note between Blacks, Hispanics, and Whites.

SUMMARY

No appreciable differences were found between ethnic groups in enrollment patterns, neither in number of semesters attended nor in number of semesters attended consecutively. White students received the highest grades, followed by Asians, Hispanics, and Blacks, in that order. A higher proportion of Blacks than any other group had GPAs of less than 2.0. These differences, however, were reflected only to a slight extent in the overall GPAs for the groups.

Job Information

Data on Job Skill Level yielded some results contrary to conventional wisdom. A comparatively smaller proportion of Blacks than other ethnic groups listed themselves as holding unskilled jobs and a greater percentage said they held professional/supervisory jobs. The SLS sample of Black students in community colleges appears to be different from that assumed in conventional view. However, because the proportion of Blacks listed as "Student Not Usually Employed" was next to highest (highest being Asians), other percentages were affected. This last response is generally thought to be associated with students from well-to-do backgrounds being supported by parents. The group with the smallest proportion in this category is Whites. More information may be available about these phenomena in the Statewide Longitudinal Study report for academic 1980-81 because of an item addressing the issue of how students finance their education.

With respect to the variables JOB CHANGE, HOURS WORKED, HOURLY PAY, and PAY CHANGE, Blacks have done better than the sample as a whole in getting better jobs.

There appear to be no other appreciable differences between ethnic groups on these dimensions.

Student Prototypes

Though overall, no appreciable differences were found between the ethnic groups with respect to Transfer, Vocational, and Special Interest goals, differences worthy of comment were found on some specific Prototypes. Within the Transfer group, a lesser percentage of Blacks and Hispanics were found to be Full-Time Transfer Students than Whites or Asians. Only 6.3 percent of Blacks and 8.4 percent of Hispanics are in this category compared with 11.6 percent of Whites. The same findings exist with respect to Part-Time Transfer Students.

A higher percentage of Blacks and Hispanics than Whites were found to be Undisciplined Transfer Students (those with a transfer goal who have been unable to earn credit). Among Blacks and Hispanics the greater percentages listed themselves as Basic Skills Students (students with a goal of obtaining skills in the basic subjects of math and reading) than the sample as a whole.

A greater percentage of Hispanics than either Blacks or Whites were judged Career Program Completers (those who intend to take a complete vocational program). A higher percentage of Blacks and Hispanics than Whites were Job Seekers (those who only want enough skills to obtain a beginning level job). Blacks and Hispanics do not attend community colleges to upgrade job skills as often as Whites.

VOCATIONAL STUDENT FINDINGS BY ETHNICITY

This section repeats the comparisons among ethnic groups made in the previous section using only students identified as one of the vocational prototypes.

Table 4-12 shows that a greater percentage of both Blacks and Whites attend one semester only than Asians or Hispanics. The percentages of the groups attending two semesters are approxi-

Table 4-12. Vocational Students: Consecutive Enrollment by Ethnicity

Group	One Semester	Two Semesters	Three Semesters	Four Semesters	Sporadic Attendance	N
	%	%	%	%	%	
Asian	27.9	19.7	12.2	29.3	10.9	147
Black	36.0	20.6	10.3	24.8	8.3	214
Hispanic	26.8	25.3	12.1	28.4	7.3	257
White	34.4	20.7	10.9	24.3	9.7	1510

mately equal, with Hispanics slightly higher than the others. This is also true with three semesters of consecutive attendance. Asians and Hispanics are equal, and highest, for four-semester attendance, with Blacks and Whites similar in this regard.

With respect to Grade Point Average (Table 4-13), Blacks receive the greatest percentage of GPAs less than 2.0. Asians and Hispanics are approximately equal, and Whites are lowest. The three minorities are approximately equal with respect to C grades. Whites have more grades higher than C than other ethnic groups.

Table 4-13. Vocational Students: GPA by Ethnicity

Group	0-.9	1.0-1.9	2.0-2.9	3.0-3.9	4.0	N
	%	%	%	%	%	
Asian	1.9	14.3	43.2	33.0	7.7	155
Black	8.1	23.8	45.3	19.2	3.5	172
Hispanic	.8	15.0	52.6	29.1	2.6	268
White	1.8	6.7	37.8	42.3	11.5	1501

Table 4-14 shows the mean GPA of each group. In these computations, students with zero GPA (receiving all Ws or all Credit/No Credit grades) were excluded. The differences noted in Table 4-13 were smoothed out by the process of obtaining mean GPAs, with the result that the groups are substantially similar, though Whites outperformed all minority groups by a small margin.

Table 4-14. Vocational Students: Mean GPA by Ethnicity

Group	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
Asians	2.67	.82	154
Blacks	2.16	.91	173
Hispanic	2.55	.68	280
White	2.83	.79	1507

Table 4-15 shows the distribution of vocational student job skill levels by Ethnicity. Though there are no dramatic differences, some discrepancies are worth noting. Asians and Hispanics have the highest percentage of students in Unskilled Jobs, and the four groups appear to have equal percentage holding Semi-Skilled

Table 4-15. Vocational Students: Job Level by Ethnicity

Group	Un-Skilled	Semi-Skilled	Skilled	Profes-sional/Super-visory	Comm-ercial	Home-Maker	Student Un-Employed	Non-Student Un-Employed	N
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	
Asian	7.4	32.1	25.9	2.5	2.5	2.5	24.7	2.5	81
Black	5.5	35.6	24.7	8.2	5.5	0	17.8	2.7	73
Hispanic	8.2	33.6	25.3	2.1	4.1	2.1	17.8	5.5	146
White	4.6	30.5	33.4	7.9	3.6	4.0	12.4	3.1	776

*Category "Other" omitted because of small percentages

Jobs. The three minority groups have equal percentages holding Skilled jobs, with Whites several percentage points higher. Asians and Hispanics are similar with respect to Professional/ Supervisory Jobs, while Blacks and Whites are similar. This last finding runs counter to conventional opinion. Small percentages of each group held sales (Commercial) jobs.

Table 4-16 shows the extent to which the ethnic groups have obtained a change of level in job skill since the previous interview in Fall 1979. Very small percentages of each group reported that they held a job with lower job skills. Approximately the same percentage of each group reported holding jobs that required the same or more skills.

Table 4-16. Vocational Students: Job Change by Ethnicity

Group	Less Skill	Same Skill	More Skill	N
	%	%	%	
Asian	2.1	70.8	27.1	44
Black	2.2	68.9	28.9	45
Hispanic	4.6	65.5	29.9	87
White	2.6	67.1	30.2	52.9

With respect to wages (Table 4-17), Whites have the highest average wage ($6.21 per hour), Asians and Blacks very similar, and Hispanics the lowest. This last may be a reflection of the percentage of Hispanics holding Unskilled Jobs (See Table

4-15). It is also of interest that Whites had the greatest variability in wage with a Standard Deviation (S.D.) of $3.47.

Table 4-17. Vocational Students: Wages by Ethnicity

Group	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
Asians	$5.76	$3.13	52
Blacks	5.79	2.81	45
Hispanic	5.09	2.02	94
White	6.21	3.47	541

With respect to change in wages (Table 4-18), Hispanics reported the highest proportion of their group receiving less pay and Blacks the least. The highest percentage reporting same wages were the Asians and the lowest, Blacks. Blacks were the most successful in achieving higher wages, and Asians the least.

Table 4-18. Vocational Students: Wage Change by Ethnicity

Group	Less Pay	Same Pay	More Pay	N
	%	%	%	
Asian	6.8	50.0	43.2	44
Black	2.2	35.6	62.2	45
Hispanic	8.0	40.9	51.5	88
White	6.9	47.1	45.9	505

Hispanics were more successful than Whites in obtaining more pay. The figures above do not include cost-of-living increases. Interviewers were instructed to treat any increase less than 10 percent as "Same Pay."

With respect to Prototypes (Table 4-19), Asians had the highest proportion of Technical Transfers. The other three groups were approximately equal. The largest percentage of Hispanics were Vocational Program Completing Students and the lowest, Black. Asians and Whites were similar in percentage. The highest percentage of Blacks were Job Seekers. Whites were similar to Asians and Hispanics somewhat higher. The highest percentage of Whites were Job Upgraders, with the rest of the groups approximately similar. The groups did not differ appreciably with respect to Career Changer. There was a smaller percentage of Blacks and Hispanics among License Maintainers than Asians and Whites.

Table 4-19. Vocational Students: Prototypes by Ethnicity

Group	Vocational Transfer	Journeyman	Job Seeker	Job Upgrader	Career Changer	License Maintainer	N
	%	%	%	%	%	%	
Asian	22.8	12.4	31.3	22.3	9.8	1.6	193
Black	16.3	8.5	47.3	19.8	7.8	.4	258
Hispanic	18.8	16.1	37.7	21.0	6.1	.3	329
White	17.0	11.8	32.3	30.4	6.8	1.8	1827

SUMMARY

These findings do not support the often-stated belief that White students uniformly outperform minority students in academic production and in the benefits received from a community college education. Nor do they support the assertions in recently published studies that community college vocational education has unequal effects on White and minority students. No clear pattern emerges from these data. Instead, patterns differ between variables. In some areas, Asians and Whites appear to be similar, in others, Blacks and Whites. In few cases does it appear that the "disadvantaged minorities" (Blacks and Hispanics) are substantially outperformed by the other two groups.

Though the pattern is not definitive, Hispanics are outperformed by other groups in several areas. It is beyond the scope of the present study to determine the reason for this, and it appears that the matter deserves greater study. One hypothesis is that a small but significant number of recent Mexican immigrants are part of the Hispanic sample, and their language handicap interferes with their college performance.

Chapter 5

The Financially Disadvantaged Student

During the Fall semester of 1978, each interviewed student was asked, "Will money be a problem for you while you are attending college?" All interviewers were trained to differentiate between students who needed extra spending money for parties, skiing weekends, and so forth, and students who were in need of funds to support themselves.

Table 5-1 below shows the distributions of Financially Disadvantaged Students within each of the participating colleges. Many of the tables in this chapter contain only those students who were in attendance in Spring 1980. The range of proportions is from 7 percent at Foothill to 43 percent at Imperial Valley College. Imperial Valley College is unique because of it proximity to the Mexican border and the special conditions governing attendance by Mexican residents. Other than Imperial Valley, the proportions of Financially Disadvantaged Students are rather homogeneous (7 percent to 20 percent). Considering the diversity in social milieu in which the colleges exist, one might expect a different range of proportions.

There is no apparent pattern to these data. On some campuses, the proportion of attendees is higher than in the sample as a whole, on others, it is lower. Differences in some cases are considerable and may result from differences in the local availability of financial aid.

Table 5-1. Distribution Across Colleges

College	Total Financially Disadvantaged	% Total	% Attendees	% Non-Attendees	N
Antelope	40	9	33	66	
Bakersfield	50	14	62	38	
Cerritos	31	9	45	54	
Contra Costa	35	16	37	61	
El Camino	34	8	55	44	
Foothill	34	7	35	64	
Golden WEst	49	10	20	80	
Imp. Valley	96	43	40	59	
LACC	55	16	43	56	
LAP	64	11	36	64	
Sac. City	67	20	40	59	
Evergreen	71	17	36	63	
Santa Ana	56	11	43	57	
Shasta	79	16	33	67	
Southwestern	74	17	28	72	
Total	835	13.5	39	61	

Financially Disadvantaged Students represent 13.5 percent of the sample. Table 5-2 below shows that financially disadvantaged students differ in their attendance from the sample as a whole. A larger percentage of financially disadvantaged students than sample students were in attendance in Spring 1980, the fourth semester of the study.

However, as shown in Table 5-3 below, there are no noteworthy differences between those who are and are not Financially Disadvantaged with respect to consecutive enrollments.

Table 5-2. Comparisons by Attendance in Spring 1980

All Students		Financially Disadvantaged	
Attendees	Non-Attendees	Attendees	Non-Attendees
%	%	%	%
34	65	39	61
N2455	4700	322	513

Table 5-3. Sample Consecutive Enrollment Patterns by Financially Disadvantaged

Financially Disadvantaged	First Semester	Second Semester	Third Semester	Fourth Semester	Other	N
	%	%	%	%	%	
Yes	28.1	20.5	10.5	31.9	9.0	869
No	32.7	19.8	9.7	29.1	8.7	4916

There are differences in age between the sample as a whole and financially disadvantaged students. As Table 5-4 shows, Financially Disadvantaged students are younger than the sample as a whole, and show less variability. The mean is two years lower for Financially Disadvantaged, and the standard deviation is smaller. Non-Attending Financially Disadvantaged are older than Attendees. This pattern conforms to the pattern shown in the sample as a whole (See Statewide Longitudinal Study Report No. 3). These findings are not surprising. One would expect to find that young people, having less earning power than older students, would have more trouble supporting themselves in college.

Table 5-4. Comparisons by Age

Statistic	Sample	Financially Disadvantaged All	Attendees	Non-Attendees
Mean	26.6	24.2	23.3	25.5
Median	21.4	20.5	20.0	21.7
Mode	19.0	19.0	19.0	19.0
Standard Deviation	10.8	7.9	7.2	8.6

The proportion of the sexes in the sample (Table 5-5 below) and among Financially Disadvantaged is close. The proportion of females in the group is slightly higher than among all students.

Table 5-5. Comparison of Sex Proportions

Sex	Sample	All Financially Disadvantaged	Financially Disadvantaged Attendees	Financially Disadvantaged Non-Attendees
	%	%	%	%
Male	44	41	41	41
Female	56	59	59	59
N	6214	837	388	406

Differences in the proportion of minorities (Table 5-6) in the sample and among Financially Disadvantaged are substantial. The total Financially Disadvantaged group contains a higher percentage of Blacks and Hispanics than the sample as a whole.

Of Asian Financially Disadvantaged, 63 percent remained in attendance in Fall 1979; 49 percent of Black Financially Disadvantaged were Attendees, 51 percent Hispanics, and only 44 percent White Financially Disadvantaged students were Attendees. Though this finding is of interest, given the multiplicity of variables governing longevity of attendance, it is doubtful that the fact that a higher percentage of all minorities remained in attendance can be attributed to any single cause.

Table 5-6. Comparison of Ethnic Proportions

Group	Sample	All Financially Disadvantaged	Financially Disadvantaged Attendees	Financially Disadvantaged Non-Attendees
	%	%	%	%
Asian/Pac.	6.7	6.3	63	37
Black	8.9	14.8	49	51
Hispanic	13.1	23.9	51	49
White	68.4	52.0	44	56
N	5754	837	401	383

In GPA, the differences that exist between those who are and are not Financially Disadvantaged (Table 5-7) are most noticeable at the top of the range. There is a smaller proportion of A grades among Financially Disadvantaged than among the more well-to-do group. However, the means and standard deviations of the grade point averages are minimally different (Table 5-8).

Table 5-7. GPA by Financially Disadvantaged

Financially Disadvantaged	0.0.9	1-1.9	2-2.9	3-3.9	4.0	N
	%	%	%	%	%	
Yes	4.3	13.9	41.9	33.7	6.2	660
No	2.2	12.0	38.8	35.2	10.9	3804

Table 5-8. Mean GPAs by Financially Disadvantaged

Financially Disadvantaged	Mean	Standard Deviation
Yes	2.64	.87
No	2.71	.88

JOB SKILL LEVELS by Financially Disadvantaged are shown in Table 5-9. These data indicate that there is a smaller proportion of Financially Disadvantaged students in Skilled jobs and a larger proportion showing themselves as Student, Not Employed. In view of the findings on AGE (Table 5-4), this is not surprising. Because Financially Disadvantaged students are younger, it follows that a smaller proportion of them hold Skilled jobs.

Table 5-9. Job Skill Level by Financially Disadvantaged

Financially Disadvantaged	Un-Skilled	Semi-Skilled	Skilled	Professional Supervisory	Commercial	Other	Home-Maker	Student Un-Employed	Non-Student Un-Employed	N
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	
Yes	9.5	32.7	17.3	4.2	1.2	0.6	2.4	26.2	6.0	336
No	8.5	32.3	23.0	5.7	4.0	1.0	5.7	16.0	3.8	1929

Table 5-10, showing the JOB SKILL LEVEL CHANGE, indicates that, while a slightly larger proportion of Financially Disadvantaged Students now hold lower skill level jobs than previously, a considerably larger percentage of them than non-Financially Disadvantaged also hold higher skill level jobs than previously.

Table 5-10. Job Skill Level Change by Financially Disadvantaged

Financially Disadvantaged	Lower	Same	Higher	N
	%	%	%	
Yes	4.5	64.2	31.3	176
No	3.7	69.9	26.3	1177

Table 5-11 shows the mean wages of the two groups. Financially Disadvantaged students earn substantially less than the other group.

Table 5-11. Wages by Financially Disadvantaged

Financially Disadvantaged	Mean	Standard Deviation
Yes	$4.92	$3.22
No	5.84	3.34

Comparing the two groups with respect to WAGE CHANGE (defined as more than 10 percent to adjust for cost-of-living increases), Financially Disadvantaged Students do not do as well in obtaining more money on their job as those non-disadvantaged. There is no data to suggest a reason for this difference. It is possible that the disadvantaged students are less assertive in requesting wages, or it is also possible that this difference is a reflection of the type of job held (see Table 5-9). Holders of Unskilled and Semi-Skilled jobs may not be in as powerful a position with respect to obtaining raises as Skilled employees.

Table 5-12. WAGE CHANGE by Financially Disadvantaged

Financially Disadvantaged	Lower	Same	Higher	N
	%	%	%	
Yes	6.7	56.1	37.2	164
No	6.6	47.1	46.3	1139

Tables 5-13, 5-14, and 5-15 below show the distributions of Financially Disadvantaged and non-Financially Disadvantaged students across STUDENT PROTOTYPES.*

Table 5-13. Transfer Prototypes by Financially Disadvantaged

Financially Disadvantaged	Full Time Transfer	Part Time Transfer	Technical Transfer	Undisciplined Transfer	Athlete	Financial Support	Expediter
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Yes	9.2	7.2	9.3	13.2	1.3	0.7	0.8
No	11.3	7.4	7.6	9.3	0.7	0.3	0.5

* Percentages calculated from Total N (Table 67).

Table 5-14. Vocational Prototypes by Financially Disadvantaged

Financially Disadvantaged	Career Program Completer	Job Seeker	Job Upgrader Student	Second Career Student	License Maintainer
	%	%	%	%	%
Yes	6.8	19.3	7.1	2.0	0.1
No	4.8	14.4	13.0	3.2	0.8

Table 5-15. Special Interest Prototypes by Financially Disadvantaged

Financially Disadvantaged	Leisure Skills Student	Education Seeker	Art & Culture Student	Explorer/ Experimenter Student	Basic Skills Student	Lateral Transfer Student	Total N
	%	%	%	%	%	%	
Yes	7.9	5.3	0.9	2.7	5.6	0.5	856
No	13.0	6.7	1.1	2.9	2.5	0.7	4828

The data from these three tables indicate four significant differences between the two groups, all support conventional wisdom. There are substantially greater percentages of Undisciplined Transfer Students, Job Seekers, and Basic Skills Students among the Financially Disadvantaged, and a lesser percentage of Job Upgraders and Leisure Students than the other group. The data provide no definitive reasons to explain these differences.

The only significant difference among the Transfer Prototypes is the relatively large percentage of Unmotivated Transfer students in the Financially Disadvantaged group. One can only speculate that many in the group fall into middle and lower socio-economic classes, and, as a consequence for some, their transfer aspirations extend beyond their academic abilities.

Among Vocational Prototypes, there is a somewhat larger percentage of Career Program Completers among Financially Disadvantaged than among others. It is evident that financial difficulty is no bar to holding long-term educational ambitions. It is also mildly contradictory with findings below. A considerably higher percentage of Job Seekers are Financially Disadvantaged than otherwise.

Job Seekers are likely to be those who lack job skills and therefore obtain menial and low-paying jobs. It is evident, however, that some members of the Financially Disadvantaged group seek immediate solutions to their job problem through Job Seeking, while others seek it through longer range study as Career Program Completers.

That there is a smaller proportion of Job Upgrading Students among the Financially Disadvantaged is not surprising, as students in this Prototype, by definition, already hold jobs in their chosen career. Furthermore, most of them take no more than one or two classes at night outside of their normal working hours.

Among Special Interest Students, the chief finding of interest is that more than twice the number of Basic Skills Students are Financially Disadvantaged than otherwise. If educational skills are a necessary prerequisite to success in the world of work, this is heartening because it indicates that a number of those who lack funds recognize the need for education as a means of increasing their capacity to earn money. This finding is further explained by previously reported results indicating that many recent immigrants are both financially disadvantaged and lack English language skills.

SUMMARY

Financially Disadvantaged Students tend to be a younger, more homogeneous group than others and contain a higher proportion of women. Among ethnic groups, there was a higher proportion of Financially Disadvantaged among Blacks and Hispanics than other groups.

There were no noteworthy differences between financially Disadvantaged and other students with respect to ENROLLMENT PATTERNS or GPA. With respect to JOB SKILL LEVEL, HOURLY WAGE, and other job-oriented data, the differences found were expected. A smaller percentage of the Financially Disadvantaged hold skilled jobs, and they earn less pay. They do not appear to be as successful in obtaining raises as other students.

Among PROTOTYPES, there is no pattern that shows that being Financially Disadvantaged is a definitive bar to aspiration or achievement in community colleges. Otherwise, the differences found were those expected, given the definition of the group.

VOCATIONAL STUDENT FINDINGS BY FINANCIAL DISADVANTAGE

Following are the findings on vocational students crosstabulated by Financial Disadvantage (Yes/No). Findings are reported on

ENROLLMENT PATTERNS, GPA, JOB SKILL LEVEL, JOB SKILL CHANGE, WAGES, WAGE CHANGE, and STUDENT PROTOTYPE.

Table 5-16 below contains data on ENROLLMENT PATTERNS. Financially Disadvantaged vocational students tend to remain longer in college than others. A smaller percentage of them attend only one semester than other students. The findings are opposite with respect to two semesters of attendance.

Table 5-16. Vocational Students:

Continuous Attendance by Financially Disadvantaged

Financially Disadvantaged	First Semester	Second Semester	Third Semester	Fourth Semester	Other	N
	%	%	%	%	%	
Yes	28.7	25.0	12.0	26.3	8.0	300
No	34.4	20.8	11.2	24.7	9.0	1729

Fewer Financially Disadvantaged received GPAs greater than 3.0 than other vocational students (Table 5-17). Other differences are minimal. Overall GPA differences are less than 0.1 (Table 5-18).

Table 5-17. Vocational Students: GPA by Financially Disadvantaged

Financially Disadvantaged	0-.9	1.0-1.9	2.0-2.9	3.0-3.9	4.0	N
	%	%	%	%	%	
Yes	1.3	12.6	44.2	36.5	5.0	303
No	2.2	9.1	39.6	38.8	10.5	1702

Table 5-18. Vocational Students: Mean GPA by Financially Disadvantaged

Group	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
Yes	2.70	.79	309
No	2.75	.81	1719

As Table 5-19 shows, more Financially Disadvantaged Vocational Students hold Unskilled or Semi-Skilled jobs than other students. Fewer of the Financially Disadvantaged group hold either Skilled jobs or Professional/Supervisory jobs. Similarly, a larger percentage of the Financially Disadvantaged are Students Not Usually Employed than the other group.

Table 5-19. Vocational Students: Job Skill Level

Financially Disadvantaged	Un-Skilled	Semi-Skilled	Skilled	Professional Supervisory	Commercial	Other	Home-Maker	Student Un-Employed	Non-Student Un-Employed	N
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	
Yes	8	36	21	3	1	1	2	22	6	154
No	5	30	32	7	4	1	4	14	3	930

On the other hand, Financially Disadvantaged Vocational Students appear to do better than other students in increasing the skill level of their jobs. Table 5-20 shows that more of them hold Higher Skill Level jobs.

Table 5-20. Vocational Students:
Job Skill Level Change by Financially Disadvantaged

Financially Disadvantaged	Lower	Same	Higher	N
	%	%	%	
Yes	2.0	64.6	33.3	99
No	2.9	67.6	29.5	586

Not surprisingly (Table 5-21), Financially Disadvantaged students were found to have a lower average wage than other students though the groups are similarly homogeneous. Financially Disadvantaged students (Table 5-22) did not improve their pay as much

Table 5-21. Vocational Students: Wages by Financially Disadvantaged

Group	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
Yes	$4.94	$3.38	102
No	$6.20	$3.28	602

Table 5-22. Vocational Students: Wage Change by Financially Disadvantaged

Financially Disadvantaged	Lower	Same	Higher	N
	%	%	%	
Yes	4.3	55.9	39.8	93
No	7.3	44.6	48.1	563

as other vocational students, but almost 40 percent raised their salary significantly.

Table 5-23 contains crosstabulation of STUDENT PROTOTYPE by FINANCIAL DISADVANTAGE. More Financially Disadvantaged students are Vocational Transfer, Vocational Program Completers, and Job Seekers than other students. Less of the Financially Disadvantaged group were Job Upgraders, Career Changers, or License Maintainers than others.

Table 5-23. Vocational Students: Prototypes by Financially Disadvantaged

Financially disadvantaged	Vocational Transfer	Vocational Program Completers	Job Seeker	Job Upgrader	Career Changer	License Maintainer	N
	%	%	%	%	%	%	
Yes	20.9	15.2	43.2	16.0	4.5	.3	382
No	17.3	11.0	32.9	29.8	7.3	1.8	2111

SUMMARY

The data do not appear to support the contention that students identified as financially disadvantaged are severely hampered in making progress in community colleges. They appear to attend longer and more consistently than other students, and their grade point average is the same as other vocational students. A smaller percentage hold skilled jobs, and a larger percentage are unemployed, but this is a tautological finding. They appear to outperform other students in terms of obtaining higher skill level jobs, though they do not do as well as other students in terms of getting raises. This finding is the same for both all sample students and for vocational students. The former finding indicates that they benefit from their community college experience; the latter is a variable not under college control. Other differences between the groups are a function of the definition of Financial Disadvantage.

These data are encouraging. California Community Colleges appear to provide opportunities for study and advancement that are as effective for Financially Disadvantaged Students as for those in less strained economic circumstances.

Chapter 6

The Educationally Disadvantaged Student

During the Fall semester of 1978, each interviewed student was asked, "Do you think you will have trouble with things like reading and math?" If they answered "yes" they were identified as Educationally Disadvantaged. Educationally Disadvantaged Students represent 14 percent of the sample. Table 6-1 shows the distribution of Educationally Disadvantaged Students with each of the participating colleges.

Table 6-1. Educationally Disadvantaged by College

College	Total Educationally Disadvantaged	% Total	% Attendees	% Non-Attendees
Antelope Valley	41	9.5	34	66
Bakersfield	26	7.0	62	38
Cerritos	15	4.2	33	67
Contra Costa	9	4.1	22	77
El Camino	21	4.8	5	95
Foothill	46	9.5	44	56
Golden West	54	11.3	35	65
Imperial Valley	77	34.7	40	60
L.A.C.A.	47	13.3	43	57
L.A. Pierce	94	16.7	43	57
Sac. City	70	20.8	34	66
Evergreen	81	18.9	33	67
Santa Ana	64	12.2	47	53
Shasta	95	18.9	29	71
Southwestern	105	24.2	29	71

No clear patterns exist in these data. The range of values is considerable, but no general pattern can be discerned with respect to percentage of Educationally Disadvantaged and type of community served by a given set of colleges (e.g. rural/suburban/urban). The high percentage found at Imperial Valley and Southwestern Colleges is probably a function of the large number of Spanish-speaking Mexican nationals in attendance.

A larger percentage of Educationally Disadvantaged Students than all sample students were not in attendance in Spring 1980 (Table 6-2 below).

Table 6-2. Educationally Disadvantaged by Attendance

	All Students		Educationally Disadvantaged	
	Attendees	Non-Attendees	Attendees	Non-Attendees
	%	%	%	%
	43	57	38	62
N	2919	3888	319	526

Table 6-3 below shows the enrollment patterns for Educationally Disadvantaged Students and others. There are no differences in enrollment patterns.

Comparisons between those who were Educationally Disadvantaged and those not so disadvantaged on the variables of AGE and SEX are miniscule. These variables are unrelated to the need for special academic assistance or tutoring.

Table 6-3. Consecutive Enrollment Patterns by Educationally Disadvantaged

Educationally Disadvantaged	First Semester	Second Semester	Third Semester	Fourth Semester	Other	N
	%	%	%	%	%	
Yes	29	21	9	32	9	834
No	33	20	10	29	9	5313

Table 6-4 below provides a comparison between the distribution of ethnic groups across the entire sample and that across those Educationally Disadvantaged. These data show that there is a substantially higher percentage of Educationally Disadvantaged among Hispanics. Whites have the lowest percentage. It is likely that difficulty with the English language accounts for the difference between Hispanics and other groups.

Table 6-4. Comparison of Ethnic Proportions

Group	% of Sample	% of Educationally Disadvantaged Students
American Indian	.9	1.1
Asian/Pacific	6.7	9.3
Black	8.9	9.3
Hispanic	13.1	25.7
White	68.4	51.1
Other	2.0	3.6
N	5754	845

Table 6-5 below contains the frequencies of student GPA, and Table 6-6 shows the mean GPA earned by Educationally Disadvantaged and other students. Though the Educationally Disadvantaged have a higher proportion of C, D, and F grades and a lower proportion A and B grades than the sample, the mean GPA difference is only 0.27 of a grade point.

Table 6-5. Educationally Disadvantaged by GPA

Group	0-.9	1.0-1.9	2.0-2.9	3.0-3.9	4.0	N
Yes	4.3	18.9	43.7	26.6	6.0	834
No	3.0	10.5	39.7	35.9	10.8	5313

Table 6-6. Educationally Disadvantaged by Mean GPA

Group	$\overline{X}$
Yes	2.46
No	2.73

Percentages of the two groups in JOB SKILL LEVEL are in Table 6-7 below. A larger percentage of Educationally Disadvantaged Students hold Unskilled and Semi-Skilled jobs and are Student, Unemployed than others. A smaller percentage are in Skilled or Supervisory jobs.

Table 6-7. Educationally Disadvantaged by JOB SKILL LEVEL

Group	Un-Skilled	Semi-Skilled	Skilled	Professional Super-visory	Comm-ercial	Other	Home-Maker	Student Un-Employed	Non-Student Un-Employed	N
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	
Yes	13.8	28.5	18.8	2.0	3.0	1.3	5.0	22.1	5.4	298
No	7.7	32.8	23.1	5.9	3.7	.9	5.0	16.8	4.0	2044

JOB CHANGE, the change in skill level of jobs held by students, is shown in Table 6-8. Unlike Financially Disadvantaged Students, Educationally Disadvantaged are more likely to accept lower skill jobs, and less likely to obtain higher skill jobs than other students.

Table 6-8. Educationally Disadvantaged by JOB CHANGE*

Group	Less Skill	Same Skill	More Skill	N
	%	%	%	
Yes	7.2	68.6	24.2	153
No	3.5	69.6	27.0	1245

*Reduced Ns are a result of students unemployed

Average hourly wage is shown in Table 6-9 below. Educationally Disadvantaged Students make substantially lower salaries than other students.

Table 6-9. Educationally Disadvantaged by Average Wage

Group	$\bar{X}$	S
Yes	5.00	2.40
No	5.81	3.40

Comparing the two groups with respect to PAY CHANGE (Table 6-10), more Educationally Disadvantaged than others appear to maintain their pay level, and fewer receive less pay than other students. They are not as successful, however, in obtaining pay raises.

Table 6-10. Educationally Disadvantaged by PAY CHANGE

Group	Less Pay	Same Pay	More Pay
	%	%	%
Yes	2.6	56.2	41.2
No	7.2	47.4	45.4

Tables 6-11, 6-12, and 6-13 below show the distribution of Educationally Disadvantaged and other students across all Prototypes. Fewer Full-Time Transfer Students and more Unmotivated Transfer Students are Educationally Disadvantaged than otherwise. There are no other important differences among Transfer Prototypes.

The only important difference among Vocational Prototypes is the Improving Skills Student, with substantially fewer Educationally Disadvantaged than otherwise. Among Special Interest Prototypes, the only important differences are fewer Leisure Skills and more Basic Skills Students, both expected differences.

Table 6-11. Educationally Disadvantaged by Transfer Prototype

Group	Full Time Transfer	Part-Time Transfer	Technical Transfer	Undisciplined Transfer	Athlete	Financial Support	Expediter
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Yes	8.5	7.8	6.4	14.1	.8	.9	.2
No	11.1	7.1	8.0	9.3	.8	.3	.5

Table 6-12. Educationally Disadvantaged by Vocational Prototype

Group	Career Program Completer	Job Seeker	Improving Skills Student	Second Career Student	License Maintainer
	%	%	%	%	%
Yes	4.6	14.0	8.4	2.3	.4
No	5.3	15.1	12.6	3.2	.7

Table 6-13. Educationally Disadvantaged by Special Interest Prototype

Group	Leisure Skills Student	Ed-cation Seeker	Art & Culture Student	Explorer/ Experi-menter Student	Basic Skills Student	Lateral Transfer	N
	%	%	%	%	%	%	
Yes	9.2	5.6	.5	3.0	11.8	1.1	823
No	12.6	6.6	1.2	3.2	2.0	.6	5170

SUMMARY

The data show no important differences between the Educationally Disadvantaged members of the sample and other students with respect to SEX, and ENROLLMENT PATTERNS, and only differences with respect to GPA and PROTOTYPES. A smaller proportion of Full-Time Transfer Students and a larger proportion of Undisciplined Transfer Students are among Educationally Disadvantaged than others. These findings are not surprising and seem to confirm the usefulness of the operational definition. (The question "Do you think you will have trouble with things like reading and math at ----------College?")

Comparing ethnic groups, a larger percentage of Educationally Disadvantaged are to be found among Hispanics than in other groups, and a lower percentage of Whites.

The data with respect to JOB SKILL LEVEL support the contention that academic ability with respect to reading and mathematics is likely to provide better job opportunities for those who possess it. A higher percentage of Educationally Disadvantaged work at Unskilled or Semi-Skilled jobs, and a lower percentage in Skilled or Professional/Supervisory jobs. In addition, a higher proportion of Educationally Disadvantaged students are Unemployed than others. The same appears true for student ability to obtain improvement in JOB SKILL LEVEL. A higher proportion of Educationally Disadvantaged were in Lower Skill Level Jobs, and a lower proportion in Higher Skill Level Jobs than other students. Educationally Disadvantaged students had a lower average HOURLY WAGE than others.

These data suggest that it is important to identify Educationally Disadvantaged Students early in their careers so that they can improve with the help of opportunities offered them by community colleges. Given the high proportion of Educationally Disadvantaged among Hispanics, this is, in part, a job for EOP&S directors and counseling staffs.

VOCATIONAL STUDENTS FINDINGS BY EDUCATIONAL DISADVANTAGE

In Table 6-14 below, Vocational Educationally Disadvantaged Students are compared with other students. There are no noteworthy differences between the groups.

The distribution of GPA of the two groups is compared in Tables 6-15 and 6-16. No important differences were found. A slightly higher proportion of Educationally Disadvantaged earned GPAs less than 2.0 and fewer received As than other students, but the mean GPA is almost the same.

Table 6-14. Vocational Educationally Disadvantaged by Consecutive Enrollment Patterns

Group	First Semester	Second Semester	Third Semester	Fourth Semester	Other	N
	%	%	%	%	%	
Yes	25	23	9	33	10	297
No	28	20	11	32	9	2314

Table 6-15. Vocational Educationally Disadvantaged by GPA

Group	0-.9	1-1.9	2-2.9	2-3.9	4	N
Yes	1.6	12.4	42.5	38.6	4.9	297
No	2.0	9.2	40.4	38.2	10.2	2314

Table 6-16. Vocational Educationally Disadvantaged by Mean GPA

Group	$\bar{X}$
Yes	2.70
No	2.74

Table 6-17 below shows the comparisons between Educationally Disadvantaged and other Vocational Students in JOB SKILL LEVEL. A higher proportion of the former hold Unskilled jobs, and a lower proportion Skilled and Professional/Supervisory jobs. There are no other important differences between the groups.

Table 6-17. Vocational Educationally Disadvantaged by JOB SKILL LEVEL

Group	Un-Skilled	Semi-Skilled	Skilled	Professional Supervisory	Commercial	Other	Home-Maker	Student Un-Employed	Non-Student Un-Employed	N
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	
Yes	11.6	30.6	23.1	1.7	5.0	.8	4.1	18.2	5.0	121
No	4.7	31.1	31.7	7.4	3.6	.5	3.2	14.6	3.1	955

In Table 6-18, the mean HOURLY WAGE for the two groups is compared. The difference between the two groups is substantial. Part of this may be due to the difference in the numbers holding Unskilled jobs, but a greater proportion is likely due to the difference in numbers holding Professional/Supervisory jobs. These latter are outliers and strongly affect the mean.

Table 6-18. Vocational Educationally Disadvantaged by Mean Wage

Group	$\overline{X}$
Yes	5.05
No	6.14

Table 6-19 below shows the comparison on job change between the Educationally Disadvantaged and other students. No differences were found between the two groups.

Table 6-19. Vocational Educationally Disadvantaged by JOB CHANGE*

Group	Less Skill	Same Skill	More Skill	N
	%	%	%	
Yes	2.8	69.0	28.2	71
No	2.8	67.4	29.8	641

* N reduced by numbers of Unemployed

In Table 6-20 the two groups are compared with respect to PAY CHANGE. A smaller proportion of Educationally Disadvantaged are receiving Less Pay than formerly, and a higher proportion are receiving Same Pay than other students, but the proportions are approximately similar with respect to More Pay.

Table 6-20. Vocational Educationally Disadvantaged by PAY CHANGE*

Group	Less Pay	Same Pay	More Pay	N
	%	%	%	
Yes	2.9	52.9	44.3	70
No	7.5	45.4	47.0	610

* N reduced by numbers of students Unemployed

Table 6-21 below shows the proportion of the two groups by Vocational Prototype. There is a higher proportion of Educationally Disadvantaged among Job Seekers and a lower percentage among Improving Skills Students.

Table 6-21. Vocational Educationally Disadvantaged by Vocational Prototype

Group	Vocational Transfer	Career Program Completer	Job Seeker	Improving Skills Student	Second Career Student	License Maintainer	N*
	%	%	%	%	%	%	
Yes	17.8	12.8	38.7	23.2	6.4	1.0	297
No	17.8	11.8	33.6	28.1	7.1	1.6	2317

* N reduced by numbers of students unemployed

SUMMARY

Comparing Vocational Educationally Disadvantaged Students with others, no important differences were found with respect to ENROLLMENT PATTERNS, average GPA, or JOB SKILL LEVEL CHANGE. A larger proportion of the former group received D grades, and a smaller proportion A grades, but the difference in mean GPA was inconsequential.

With respect to JOB SKILL LEVEL, a larger proportion of Educationally Disadvantaged held Unskilled Jobs, and a smaller proportion Skilled and Professional/Supervisory jobs than other students, though the proportion holding Semi-Skilled jobs was about the same. A higher proportion of the former group were Unemployed. The mean HOURLY WAGE for Educationally Disadvantaged was substantially lower than for other students, which may be affected strongly by the students holding Professional/Supervisory jobs. A higher proportion of Educationally Disadvantaged were receiving Less and Same Pay, and a lower proportion More Pay than other students.

Among Prototypes, a larger proportion of Educationally Disadvantaged are Job Seekers, and a lower proportion Improving Skills Students. This may indicate that educational handicaps inhibit students from returning for additional vocational skills training.

The differences between the groups is less extreme than for all sample students. Educationally Disadvantaged Students could benefit from additional tutorial help, but the restraint placed upon progress appears less than among students in general.

Chapter 7

Special Students

One of the purposes of the SLS was to obtain information about the problems encountered by seven special student groups. They are:

1. Ethnic Minorities
2. Financially Disadvantaged
3. Educationally Disadvantaged
4. Limited English-Speaking
5. Displaced Homemakers
6. Non-Traditional Majors
7. Physically Handicapped

In previous SLS reports it was noted that Limited English Speaking, Displaced Homemakers, Non-Traditional Majors, and Physically Handicapped existed in such small numbers in the sample that generalization from numerical data would be unreliable. The decision was made to collect anecdotal data on these students, and to report on problems and solutions by categories, without frequency counts. The purpose of this chapter is to provide the flavor of a series of special interviews conducted with these students during academic year 1979-80.

The method employed to collect this information was to identify those students who in Fall 1978 and Spring 1979 had stated that they had experienced problems arising from their membership in one of the groups listed above. The questionnaire developed included questions on problems and solutions, ratings given to college facilities, and the reasons given for those ratings. Students falling into only one category were interviewed with respect to that category. Those falling into more than one (e.g. a member of an ethnic minority who was both Educationally and Financially Disadvantaged) were queried about problems within each category. (For the example given above, there would have been three data sheets.)

Data from participating colleges were sent to the project office for analysis. Responses were classified by the project staff. Anecdotal responses were copied onto cards, and the cards sorted into piles that seemed to address the same issue. No attempt was made to link problems and solutions. The report below consists of a listing of (1) problems experienced by members of each group, (2) the solutions reported, and (3) the reasons for the rating given to the college attendance.

FINDINGS

The findings are classified by responses from each of the seven special groups mentioned earlier. These findings will be followed by the results of the overall rating given by each of the groups.

Ethnic Minority Student Problems

Few minority students reported experiencing problems arising directly from their minority status. (Language problems correlated with minority status will be dealt with under Limited English-Speaking Students.) Problems encountered were:

Prejudice from Teachers

A few students reported receiving prejudicial treatment from instructors. Because no examples were given, it is not possible to determine the nature of the difficulty, or whether it arose from insensitivity of instructors or hypersensitivity of students.

Alienation from Students: Cultural Displacement

Some students reported feeling alienated from the majority White students on campus. The cause appeared to be that minority students felt an unbridgeable cultural gap between themselves and the majority. This alienation was more likely to occur on campuses that were heavily White (e.g., Foothill or Pierce) than those with a heavy percentage of a given ethnic minority (e.g., Los Angeles City College).

Minority Student Solutions

Prejudice from Teachers

Some who felt discriminated against due to their ethnic background reported that they dropped the class in question and/or took another section with another teacher.

Alienation from Students: Cultural Displacement

Those who reported alienation had no solutions.

They learned to "tolerate" it, did not use the campus for social activities, and engaged in socialization with non-college acquaintances and friends. This may have broad ramifications because socialization with fellow students is one of the known benefits of an educational experience.

Financially Disadvantaged Student Problems

Books, Supplies, Gasoline, etc.

Financially Disadvantaged students reported difficulties in paying for books, college supplies, and gasoline.

Full-Time/Part-Time

Many poor students said that they could not work full-time and go to college full-time. They said that financial aid requires full-time attendance. Many who had left college reported that they did not want to go to school part-time because it would take too long to complete their work.

Lack of Financial Aid

Some students reported that they had not applied for financial aid, though no reasons were given. Others said that they could not qualify.

Financially Disadvantaged Student Solutions

Financial Aid Solutions

Many students reported receiving financial aid in the form of scholarships, veterans aid, social security, rehabilitation benefits, welfare, CETA or CWS. Many students make use of financial aid available outside the college.

Job Solutions

Some students reported obtaining another job that paid them more money, obtaining a raise, or working longer hours.

Living Accommodation Solutions

Some students got roommates, found cheaper apartments, or moved back with their parents.

Budget Tightening

Some students tightened their budgets--eating out less, engaging in less expensive amusements, etc.

Left School

A few students who were unable to solve their problems left school. It is not possible to state what proportion of these were unable to qualify for aid or were insufficiently knowledgeable/assertive to seek aid actively.

Financial-Aid-Students' Comments on Financial Aids Office

1. Helpful, cooperative, do their best to help, answered questions, explained well.
2. People nice, friendly, courteous, relate well to student.
3. Well organized, efficient, direct.
4. Too much red tape, paper work.
5. Some people cranky, rude, discourteous.
6. Office sometimes slow to respond.

Educationally Disadvantaged Student Problems

English Problems

Reading, comprehension, grammar, spelling, composition.

Math Problems

Math skill problems reported with percents and fractions. No problems reported in geometry. The math problems identified are very common with students who had difficulty in upper elementary school and junior high school math.

Re-Entry Problems

A number of students reported that they had been out of school for several years and had problems adjusting to the routine of note-taking, studying, and examination preparation.

Inadequate Study Skills

Some students reported that they had inadequate study skills. These were described as inability to concentrate and being unprepared academically. Some had trouble in structuring their time. .

Educationally Disadvantaged Student Solutions

Basic Skills Classes

A number of students reported that they had solved the problem by taking courses in the problem area--basic skills and remedial courses. These solutions also involved transferring into courses requiring less academic skill.

Dropping and Avoiding Classes in the Problem Area

Some students solved the problem by dropping classes and taking easier courses in the problem area altogether. There is no information on the extent to which this affected their goal attainment.

Tutoring

Some students maintained their classes and obtained tutoring from an on-campus facility, teachers or family and friends.

Extra Study

Extra hours of study was the solution of a number of students.

Never Went for Help--Dropped Out

A few students never went for any help. Some of these problems were ended by dropping out of school.

Educationally Disadvantaged Students' Comments on Facilities

These comments refer to tutorial centers, compensatory programs, and other on-campus offices.

Some students felt that the facility personnel "cared," gave personal attention, and went out of their way to help. A few criticized equipment or staff as inadequate. Many felt that there was a good program available, that there was good equipment and study aids. They liked the fact that they could progress at their own pace and on their own time. They felt that they learned better study habits, and that the facility helped them get through their classes.

Limited English Speaking Ability (LESA) Students' Problems

Difficulty in Speaking

Some were concerned about their difficulty in speaking, especially as it related to asking questions in class or to making class presentations. They felt that their pronunciation was poor and their vocabulary limited.

Difficulty in Understanding Instruction and Other Students

A number of students mentioned difficulty in understanding lectures or other students both in and out of class.

Difficulty in Reading and Writing

Many students found it difficult to read assignments or to write the papers required.

Social Problems

LESA students reported embarrassment or isolation arising from their difficulty with English. This difficulty was a significant interaction with the cultural isolation suffered by a number of the ethnic minority students.

LESA Students' Solutions

Basic English Skills Classes

Where these were available, some LESA students attended classes in basic English (remedial reading, etc.) and found them helpful.

Exposure to English

Some students reported that the exposure to the English language in their classes helped. Presumably, these were those whose problem was not serious.

ESL Classes

Some students took ESL classes and found them helpful.

Tutoring

Like Educationally Disadvantaged Students, a number of students received tutoring from tutorial centers, faculty, or friends and family.

Dropping Classes or Dropping School

Some students dropped more difficult classes and took those less demanding. Others dropped out of school.

LESA Students' Comments on Facilities

There were few LESA student ratings of facilities. Those who did rate them said that the staff was friendly and helpful.

Displaced Homemaker Problems

Few respondents (0.4 percent) identified themselves as Displaced Homemakers. The criterion for inclusion in this category was returning for education and job training after an extended period away from the job market during which the person was engaged in maintaining a home. It is possible that inflation and other factors have reduced the number of marriages in which one partner does not work.

Financial Problems

Of those who responded, many stated that they had money problems arising from the need to support a household without the assistance of a spouse.

Child Care Problems

Child care was a major problem for a number of these students.

Displaced Homemaker Solutions

Job

A number of the respondents reported that they had solved their problems by obtaining a job.

Financial Aid

Some respondents reported that they had solved their problems by obtaining financial aid.

Children in School

A few of the respondents reported that their children were "not in school," implying that they were not of school age at the beginning of the study.

Left School

Some displaced homemakers reported that they had left school. It is not possible to determine whether these had left because their problems in school were not solvable or because they had met their goals.

No displaced homemaker reported the use of a child care center as a solution to child care problems. It is possible that obtaining jobs, or getting financial aid made this kind of solution unnecessary.

Displaced Homemaker Ratings of Facilities

Most displaced homemakers reported that facilities used were staffed by those who were helpful and understanding. One reported that she "did not get the financial aid as promised by staff."

Non-Traditional Major Problems

No students in non-traditional majors reported problems arising from that status. This finding is heartening. Though the numbers of non-traditional majors were small, few of the 6,078 students interviewed in Fall, 1978 were found to be in majors non-traditional for their sex. Because these are distributed over a number of departments, if anything definitive is to be learned about this group, a separate study will be necessary.

Physically Handicapped Problems

Reporting on these problems is difficult, partly because of the small number of students who self-identified as physically handicapped (177 out of 6,078 students interviewed in Fall 1978), and partly because they were distributed over several different categories of handicap. The following problems were reported.

Hearing

A number reported that they had difficulty in hearing lectures, and one respondent reported that instructors lacked patience with hard-of-hearing students.

Ambulatory Difficulties

Students reported difficulties in getting around campuses, especially those with hills or buildings lacking elevators.

Visual Handicap

Some students reported visual difficulties making it difficult to see chalkboards or to take notes.

Fatigue

Students with different kinds of handicaps reported that fatigue was a problem, most frequently associated with getting around campus. Students reported that movement from parking lots to classes, from class to class, etc. left them physically tired, making it difficult to attend class and to study.

Intermittent Attendance

Students with a number of disabilities reported that their condition made it impossible for them to attend classes and other functions with regularity. They required periods of bedrest which made them lose continuity of instruction.

Sitting Problem

Several students, most frequently with back problems, reported difficulty in sitting for long periods of time.

Transportation

Those who were unable to drive reported difficulties with transportation. These students found that it was difficult to get to and from buses, and to and from campuses from the nearest bus stop.

Physically Handicapped Solutions

Notetakers

A number of those visually and hearing handicapped solved their problem by hiring others to take notes for them. Presumably, for those with sight problems, this also included readers/notetakers for written materials.

Interpreters

A number of deaf students obtained interpreters for the classes, presumably to translate the instructor's lectures into sign language.

Tutoring

Students with different handicaps hired tutors. Some of these were hired to help students who could attend intermittently, others for those whose sight or hearing impairment make it difficult to follow lectures or to read.

Physically Handicapped Students' Ratings of Facilities

Most students rated the handicapped enabling facilities positively, describing the staff as caring, interested in helping and open to discussion of personal problems. They also stated that they were helpful in practical ways, providing typing services, help with registration, locating note takers, providing information about wheelchairs, etc.

SUMMARY

In general, though students in the seven special groups have problems, the services provided on campus appear adequate. The facilities provided for them appear to be serving their function. The data on which the above report was based were insufficient to provide definitive information about a number of the classes of special students. Very small numbers of displaced homemakers, non-traditional majors, LESA, and handicapped students were found in the sample. To obtain definitive information, special samples of each student group should be selected and an in-depth, longitudinal study carried out.

Chapter 8

Summary and Conclusions

This report covers, Spring 1980 data, Prototypes, and a detailed discussion of the seven special student groups identified for study in the original goals of the SLS. In-depth findings on ETHNICITY, FINANCIAL DISADVANTAGE, and EDUCATIONAL DISADVANTAGE are discussed, and a report of anecdotal information on problems encountered by each of the groups is made.

Demographic data for Spring 1980 shows that the sample still contains the same proportions of males and females, but that the sample is now slightly older than the community college population. This is expected, because a sample of first-time admittees was selected in Fall 1978. With respect to ethnic groups, there has been a 17.5 percent increase in the proportion of Blacks in attendance and a 5.6 percent increase in Hispanics.

Over two years of the study, the modal number of semesters of enrollment is one. The next most numerous enrollment pattern is continuous attendance for four semesters, followed by continuous attendance for two semesters. About 24 percent of the original sample attempted and passed zero courses and zero units; 27 percent had zero grade points. This may be partially explained by the large proportion of Prototypes whose goals have no relationship to college grades or credit.

Substantial numbers of attending students have increased both the skill level of their jobs and the pay received; 27 percent hold jobs requiring higher skills, and 45 percent have received pay raises greater than the 10 percent allowed for cost-of-living increases each year.

Among Transfer Students already attending a four-year college, 42 percent had gone to the CSUC system and 17 percent to the UC system. Almost three quarters of these students rated their community college training as either "A" or "B"; 20 percent rated the training as a "C." Among those still in college, 56 percent of Transfer Students said they wanted to attend the CSUC system, and 15 percent the UC system. Nineteen percent were Undecided. Almost a third of these students said they expected to transfer after four semesters (two years) of attendance. Twenty-seven percent felt it would take five semesters, and 20 percent expected to take six. Note that these figures do not imply continuous semesters. After but four semesters, almost 10 percent of the cohort entering in Fall 1978 had "sporadic" attendance. Sporadic attendance is expected to double by the last year of the study (1980-81). It is obvious that even with respect to the Transfer Function, California Community Colleges are not so-called two-year-colleges. More than 90 percent of Transfer Students felt that they had made either Adequate or Excellent progress toward their transfer.

Among Vocational Students, more than half (54 percent) said they were preparing for a First Career Job, and 30 percent were getting skills for their current job. Only 12 percent were preparing for a second career or a moonlight job. About 65 percent said that their courses applied either Somewhat or a Great Deal to their current job, though only 38 percent felt that their courses were helpful on the job. However, smaller percentages felt that courses were helpful in getting raises or promotions.

About 32 percent felt courses helped in getting raises, and 26 percent felt they were useful in getting promotions.

A surprising 86 percent said they thought getting credit for class was important. Many of these are probably still planning to complete programs. Some may have given socially correct answers, but may behave differently when they decide whether to take the final examination. Almost 75 percent of Vocational Students said they planned to return to take further courses at community colleges.

In general, the most frequent function that California Community Colleges perform for Vocational Students is preparation for First Career Job or Upgrading Job Skills, both short-term goals. Most feel that the courses taken relate well to their jobs, and help them on the job. Most Vocational Students plan to return to their community colleges for more work.

Student Prototypes offer community colleges faculties and administrators the opportunity to describe the mission of community colleges more accurately than ever before. Not only can the three functions of Transfer, Vocational Education, and Special Interest be defined mutually exclusively, but subsets of students within each function can be described more accurately than before.

There is also ample evidence to support the hypothesis that students relate more to courses and skills than to programs and that many of them, for positive reasons, have no interest in grades or college credit. These findings also help to explain the large number of Ws given.

The data show conclusively that California Community Colleges are not two year colleges as is commonly believed. Faculties and administrations should note this fact and shape their curriculum planning more toward the short-term student than toward those who seek AA degrees, certificates, or program completion.

The findings also show that it is necessary to develop new methods of measuring outcomes of instruction. It is plain that grades and course credit are no longer the only valid measures of student progress because many students have goals that relate to events outside the college.

In general, it is now evident that the "mission" of community colleges is determined to a far greater extent by students than by governing bodies. It is important that this be communicated to legislative committees in a positive fashion so that intelligent decisions can be made about funding community colleges.

COMPARISON OF ETHNIC GROUPS

Comparisons between ethnic groups showed that there is less difference between Asians, Blacks, Hispanics, and Whites than conventional wisdom suggests. Differences in grade point average were slight; differences in the skill level of jobs held were also held were also slight. Blacks were slightly more successful than other groups in obtaining both better jobs and higher pay.

Within Prototypes, a smaller percentage of Blacks and Hispanics were found to be Full-Time Transfer Students and a higher percentage were found to be Undisciplined Transfer Students than other groups. More Hispanics than others were Career Program Completers, and a higher percentage of Blacks and Hispanics than others were Job Seekers.

In general, it appears defensible to state that in terms of academic attendance, academic performance, academic aspirations and jobs there is less difference between ethnic groups in community colleges than is generally believed. Among Vocational Students, the pattern appears to be similar. Hispanics tend to be outperformed to some extent by other groups, and the suggestion is made that directors of EOP&S programs would do well to investigate this phenomenon. The differences, however, are not pervasive or extreme.

COMPARISONS WITH FINANCIALLY DISADVANTAGED

There is no evidence to support the contention that students self-identifying as Financially Disadvantaged are severely handicapped in making progress in community college. Both among students in general and among vocational students, differences between Financially Disadvantaged and other students were found, but most of these were solely a function of the definition of financial disadvantage. The findings are encouraging because they indicate that California Community Colleges provide opportunities for study and advancement that are similar for Financially Disadvantaged and other students.

COMPARISONS WITH EDUCATIONALLY DISADVANTAGED

Surprisingly, EDUCATIONAL DISADVANTAGE (self-defined) does not appear to have a great effect on ENROLLMENT PATTERNS and only a small effect on GPA and Prototypes.

With respect to ETHNICITY, Hispanics were found to have a higher proportion of Educationally Handicapped than other groups. The same is true to a lesser extent of Asians. Presumably these findings are a result of language difficulty.

There is evidence in the data to support the generally held belief that educational ability provides better job opportunities. A higher percentage of Educationally Disadvantaged students are found in Unskilled and Semi-Skilled jobs, and among Unemployed Students than other students.

Among Prototypes, there was a lower proportion of Full-Time Transfer Students, and a higher proportion of Undisciplined

Transfer Students. The latter finding is probably a function of the Educationally Disadvantaged definition, and, if anything, tends to validate the definition process.

Among Vocational Students, the results were similar. The data on these students showed, however, that a larger proportion of Educationally Disadvantaged were Job Seekers, and a lower proportion Improving Skills Students.

SPECIAL STUDENT FINDINGS

Among ethnic minorities, it was found that very few students had problems arising from their minority status. A few reported prejudice from instructors, and some, probably on campuses with small ethnic minority populations, reported a sense of isolation or cultural displacement.

Financially Disadvantaged Students reported difficulties in paying for books, college supplies, and for gasoline. Some of the part-time students indicated that their Financially Disadvantaged status prevented them from full-time attendance. Some withdrew because part-time attendance would stretch out the time required to reach their goals to an unreasonable extent.

Educationally Disadvantaged Students reported problems in reading, comprehension, grammar, spelling and composition. Math problems reported were in the area of fractions and percentages. Some described themselves as having a difficult re-entry, and others as having deficits in study skills.

Limited English Speaking Ability Students reported problems speaking in class, understanding instruction, and producing class reports and examinations. They also reported a sense of isolation from other students arising from their difficulties in speaking to and understanding other students. This probably accounts for some of the cultural isolation mentioned by a number of the ethnic minority students.

Few students identified themselves as Displaced Homemakers. These students reported chiefly financial difficulties arising from the absence of a breadwinner, and from difficulty in obtaining child care

No students in majors non-traditional for their sex reported problems arising from that status. Very few students were identified in this category, and it would be necessary to select a special sample to investigate this group further.

Physically Handicapped students reported difficulty in understanding lectures (deaf), in moving around campus, with fatigue, with sitting in class (those with back problems), with transportation to and from college, and with intermittent attendance caused by their handicaps. Though the list of difficulties is probably useful, this group will have to be studied in detail for definitive information to be obtained. Few students so identified themselves, and these must be subdivided among a number of different kinds of handicap. The numbers in each group were too small for effective generalization.

JUL 31 1981
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGES
96 POWELL LIBRARY BUILDING
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90024